ISLAMIC SURVEYS 5

THE ISLAMIC DYNASTIES

a chronological and genealogical handbook

CLIFFORD EDMUND BOSWORTH

EDINBURGH
at the University Press

EDINBURGH UNIVERSITY PRESS
22 George Square, Edinburgh 8
North America
Aldine Publishing Company
320 West Adams Street, Chicago
Australia and New Zealand
Hodder & Stoughton Limited
Africa, Oxford University Press
India, P. C. Manaktala & Sons
Far East, M. Graham Brash & Son
Printed in Great Britain by
T. & A. Constable Ltd., Edinburgh

FOREWORD

In 1939 the prospect of a war which would involve many Asian nations made men in positions of responsibility in Britain suddenly aware of the meagre number of our experts in Asian languages and cultures. The Scarbrough Commission was set up, and its report led to a great expansion of Oriental and African studies in Britain after the war. In the third decade after 1939 events are making clear to ever-widening circles of readers the need for something more than a superficial knowledge of non-European cultures. In particular the blossoming into independence of numerous African states, many of which are largely Muslim or have a Muslim head of state, emphasises the growing political importance of the Islamic world, and, as a result, the desirability of extending and deepening the understanding and appreciation of this great segment of mankind. Since history counts for much among Muslims, and what happened in 632 or 656 may still be a live issue, a journalistic familiarity with present conditions is not enough; there must also be some awareness of how the past has moulded the present.

This series of 'Islamic surveys' is designed to give the educated reader something more than can be found in the usual popular books. Each work undertakes to survey a special part of the field, and to show the present stage of scholarship here. Where there is a clear picture this will be given, but where there are gaps, obscurities and differences of opinion, these will also be indicated. Full and annotated bibliographies will afford guidance to those who want to pursue their studies further. There will also be some account of the nature and extent of the source material.

The present volume differs in some ways from the others so far published, though it may be said to survey the present state of our knowledge of Islamic chronology. The intention, however, is rather that it should prove a useful reference book to many classes of workers in the field of Islamic history.

The transliteration of Arabic words is essentially that of the second edition of *The Encyclopaedia of Islam* (London, 1960,

continuing) with three modifications. Two of these are normal with most British Arabists, namely, *q* for *ḳ*, and *j* for *dj*. The third is something of a novelty. It is the replacement of the ligature used to show when two consonants are to be sounded together by an apostrophe to show when they are to be sounded separately. This means that *dh*, *gh*, *kh*, *sh*, *th* (and in non-Arabic words *ch* and *zh*) are to be sounded together, where there is an apostrophe, as in *ad'ham*, they are to be sounded separately. The apostrophe in this usage represents no sound, but, since it only occurs between two consonants (of which the second is *h*), it cannot be confused with the apostrophe representing the glottal stop (*hamza*), which never occurs between two consonants.

W. Montgomery Watt
GENERAL EDITOR

THE CONTENTS

ABBREVIATIONS USED

EI[1] - *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 1st edition (Leiden 1913-36)

EI[2] - *Encyclopaedia of Islam*, 2nd edition (Leiden-London 1960)

Halil Edhem - Halil Edhem, *Düvel-i Islâmiye* (Istanbul 1345/1927)

HJAS - *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* (Cambridge, Mass.)

İA - *Islam Ansiklopedisi* (Istanbul 1940)

JA - *Journal Asiatique* (Paris)

JAOS - *Journal of the American Oriental Society* (New Haven, Conn.)

JRAS - *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* (London)

Justi - F. Justi, *Iranisches Namenbuch* (Marburg 1895)

Lane Poole - S. Lane Poole, *The Mohammadan dynasties* (London 1893)

Sachau - E. Sachau, 'Ein Verzeichnis Muhammedanische Dynastien', *Abhandlungen der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, Phil.-Hist. Klasse (Berlin 1923), No. 1

SBWAW - *Sitzungsberichte der Wiener Akademie der Wissenschaften* Phil.-Hist. Klasse (Vienna)

Zambaur - E. von Zambaur, *Manuel de généalogie et de chronologie pour l'histoire de l'Islam* (Hanover 1927)

ZDMG - *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenlandischen Gesellschaft* (Leipzig, Berlin)

INTRODUCTION

Every scholar who is concerned with the history of the Islamic world encounters the need for reliable lists of rulers, dynasties, governors, and other officials. But whereas the historian of Britain and Europe has long been well supplied with a varied selection of these *Hilfsmittel*,[1] the orientalist has a much smaller field of choice.

For Islamic scholars, Stanley Lane Poole's *The Mohammadan dynasties: chronological and genealogical tables with historical introductions* (London 1893) was a laudable pioneer work, arising out of that author's numismatic interests, and in particular out of his work on the British Museum catalogues of Islamic and Indian coins. The obvious utility of the book led speedily to a Russian translation by Wilhelm Barthold, *Musulmanskiya dynastiy* (St Petersburg 1899), to which the great historian of Central Asia appended a valuable list of his own corrections. Some twenty-five years later, Halil Edhem, Director of Museums in Istanbul, produced a Turkish version, his *Düvel-i Islâmiye* (Istanbul 1345/1927, printed in Arabic characters), with a considerable amount of fresh information on the Turkish dynasties of Anatolia, a region which Lane Poole had treated only in a cursory fashion. Meanwhile, the German Iranist Ferdinand Justi had published his *Iranisches Namenbuch* (Marburg 1895). The greater part of this work is an alphabetically-arranged dictionary of Iranian onomastic, but at the end he devoted an extensive section (pp. 390-479) to genealogical tables of Iranian dynasties; here the term 'Iranian' is interpreted in its widest sense, to cover both pre-Islamic and Islamic times and to cover dynasties which were ethnically non-Iranian but which were affected by Iranian culture and used Iranian names and titles (e.g. Georgian and Armenian families in Transcaucasia, various Turkish dynasties of Iraq, Anatolia and Persia, and the Muslim dynasties of India). Justi's tables are in

many cases founded upon a more solid and profound examination of the relevant historical and literary texts than are those of Lane Poole, and for coverage of the Iranian world and its associated regions, the *Iranisches Namenbuch* is in many respects superior to *The Mohammadan dynasties*. Also worthy of mention is Eduard Sachau's 'Ein Verzeichnis Muhammedanische Dynastien', *Abhandlungen der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, Phil.-Hist. Kl. (1923), No. 1, pp. 1–39. This contains genealogical lists of various minor lines of rulers and governors not included in Lane Poole's work. Sachau's source for these was the *Ṣaḥā'if al-akhbār* of the Ottoman scholar Aḥmad b. Luṭfallāh, called Münejjim-Bashī 'the Chief Astronomer' (d. 1113/1702), this being an abridgement in Turkish of his original work in Arabic, the *Jāmi' ad-duwal*. For this general history, Münejjim Bashī used some sources now otherwise lost, and in the Arabic original at least was careful to give genealogical charts of the dynasties treated.[2]

Over the last forty years, however, the specialist Islamic historian has had recourse to the *Manuel de généalogie et de chronologie pour l'histoire de l'Islam* of the Austrian numismatist, Eduard von Zambaur (Hanover 1927). This remarkable work is founded, as the author explains in his Preface, v–vi, on both numismatic and epigraphic evidence and on historical texts, above all on a systematic examination of the general history of Ibn al-Athīr (d. 630/1234), *al-Kāmil fī t-ta'rīkh*. The *Manuel* gives the fullest available survey of the dynasties of the Islamic world, from Spain and Morocco to India, and also includes lists of the provincial governors, of the caliphs, and of the viziers, of many of the leading dynasties. The compilation of this work was a prodigious achievement for one man, but a work on this scale can never again be undertaken by a single person. Zambaur was both a numismatist and an Arabic scholar, and was further conversant with Persian and Turkish. He was not familiar with the languages of the Islamic fringe regions, such as Hausa, Swahili, Urdu, Bengali, or Malay, and indeed, no one now can claim to encompass, even in the most superficial manner, the primary sources for the whole range of Islamic dynastic chronology. Zambaur freely confessed that the coverage in his book was far from complete, and any Islamic history specialist can point to obvious lacunae. For

instance, such dynasties as the Musha'sha'īs of Ahwāz and Lūristān, the Sultans of Ma'bar or Madura in South India, and the Khans of Sibir or Tiumen in Western Siberia, are not mentioned, and whole regions of the Islamic fringes, such as the Arab and Hausa amīrates of the southern edges of the Sahara, and Indonesia (with one or two minor exceptions) are omitted. An Arabic translation of the *Manuel* was begun under the auspices of the Cultural Commission of the Arab League by Zakī M. Ḥasan Bey, Ḥasan Aḥmad Maḥmūd *et al.* (*Mu'jam al-ansāb wa-l-usarāt al-ḥākima fī t-ta'rīkh al-Islāmī* [Cairo 1370/1951]), but no attempt was made here to correct and revise Zambaur's original work. The only prospect of a revised and expanded version of the *Manuel* would seem to be in a co-operative venture by Islamic historians, each component section being allotted to a specialist in the particular field; possibly such a project could be an adjunct to the new edition of the *Encyclopaedia of Islam* now in progress.

At the broader level, it has long seemed to me that there is also a need for a compact, up-to-date handbook to the Islamic dynasties and their chronology, a book which would be useful to orientalists not requiring the detail of Zambaur's book and to students embarking upon the study of Islamic history. Such a reference book should, moreover, be of value for historians who work in non-Islamic fields, but whose spheres of interest nevertheless overlap the Islamic world at times (e.g. historians of the Iberian peninsula, of Byzantium, of Africa, and of India). I myself have certainly found the dynastic and historical sections on the Chinese and Indian worlds in the *Handbook of oriental history*, ed. C. H. Philips (London, Royal Historical Society 1951) – a book which has, incidentally, a good section on the Near and Middle East – extremely useful for handy reference purposes.

It would be strange indeed if the thirty-nine years since the publication of Zambaur's work, and the seventy-three since the one of Lane Poole, had not brought a vastly increased knowledge of large sectors of Islamic history and its chronology. Whole dynasties, formerly known only sketchily, have now been brought into the clearer light of modern knowledge (e.g. the Qarakhanids of Transoxania, see below pp. 111-14). Wherever possible I have endeavoured to benefit from the

recent work done on the various dynasties, and to incorporate in my own tables the corrections and improvements ascertainable from these researches. Yet in this age, no one can hope to encompass the whole field of Islamic history, and it is almost inevitable that some significant modern works on history or numismatics shall have been passed over. I should, accordingly, be grateful for corrections or fresh information from those with specialist knowledge of particular areas.

The choice of dynasties to be covered in a work of this restricted compass poses obvious problems. Major dynasties like the Umayyad and ʿAbbāsid Caliphs, the Fāṭimids, the Seljuqs, the Mamlūks, the Ottomans, the Ṣafavids, and the Delhi Sultans must obviously be included without further ado. But somewhere beyond these, one reaches a point where relative significance or importance is difficult or impossible to ascertain, and where selection must include an element of arbitrary preference. Thus one might well ask why, amongst the dynasties of South Arabia, should the Ṣulayḥids and Rasūlids of the Yemen be included but not the Najāḥids or Zurayʿids? Or why the more recent dynasties of Muslim India, such as the Nawābs of Bengal, Oudh, and Arcot, the Niẓāms of Hyderabad and the Sultans of Mysore, are not to be found? I can only say that I have tried to give reasonably equal space to all the main geographical regions of the classical Islamic world, from North Africa to India, whilst regretfully renouncing any attempt at coverage of Indonesia or black Africa.

Lane Poole prefixed to each list of rulers in his book a short account of the dynasty in question, accounts which, he said, 'do not attempt to relate the internal history of each dynasty; they merely show its place in relation to other dynasties and trace its origins, its principal extensions, and its downfall; they seek to define the boundaries of its dominions, and to describe the chief steps in its aggrandisement and in its decline' (Preface, vi). These accounts were an eminently useful feature of *The Mohammadan dynasties*, and I have thought it worth while to add similar accounts to my own dynastic lists. Certainly, if a book on Islamic dynastic chronology is to be of use at all for students and for non-Islamic scholars, such brief introductions seem to be essential. My aim here has been similar to that of Lane Poole: not to give a potted history, for the page or so

available in the case of the major dynasties would suffice only for a derisory account, but to place the dynasty in the broad context of Islamic history; to outline some of the major trends of its period; and where relevant, to indicate some of the dynasty's achievements. It should be noted that the bibliographical references at the foot of each article are to the sources found useful in compiling the list of rulers, *sc.* in elucidating chronology and titulature. They are not references to works on the general history of the dynasty in question; for such indications, one should consult the bibliographies given in the relevant *Encyclopaedia of Islam* articles, or the works described in Cl. Cahen's *refonte* of Jean Sauvaget's *Introduction à l'histoire de l'Orient Musulman: éléments de bibliographie* (Paris 1961), English translation (unfortunately, with rather more cursory bibliographical references), *Introduction to the history of the Muslim East: a bibliographical guide* (Berkeley and Los Angeles 1965).

Following Lane Poole, I have given dates in both the Muslim *Hijrī* and Christian eras. It should be noted by non-Islamic scholars that whilst the pre-Islamic Arabs used a solar calendar, the Prophet Muḥammad introduced a lunar year of 354 days, the twelve months having twenty-eight, twenty-nine or thirty days in them. The *Hijrī* months do not therefore correspond with the four seasons of the year, as do the Christian Gregorian ones or the Jewish ones, but begin slightly earlier each year. For instance, the month of Ramaḍān 1387 begins on December 3rd, 1967. As we have seen that the Muslim year is eleven days shorter than the Christian Gregorian one, the next Ramaḍān would begin on November 22nd, 1968. It will thus take about thirty-three Christian years before Ramaḍān begins again in early December. In this way, the ninety-seven Christian years are approximately equal to a hundred Muslim years.

It is difficult to convert quickly from Christian to *Hijrī* dates and vice-versa, and recourse has usually to be made to conversion tables.[3] In fact, a shifting lunar calendar has obvious disadvantages for the fixing of recurrent agricultural operations or financial transactions, and solar calendars soon came into use in the Islamic world for these practical purposes. Today, most of the Islamic world follows the European Gregorian calendar for purely secular and everyday purposes; Persia and Afghan-

istan, however, use a solar year which runs from the year of Muḥammad's *hijra* or migration from Mecca to Medina in 622. But the primary records for Islamic history up to the nineteenth century, whether written in manuscripts or in numismatic or epigraphic form, are almost invariably dated in the *Hijrī* system, and the dates of accessions, deaths, etc. are accordingly given in it.

Since the Christian and Muslim years hardly ever correspond, it follows that it is impossible to give equivalent dates with complete accuracy unless the month and day of the *Hijrī* year are known; but the Islamic sources are by no means always as exact as this. In this book, I have followed two basic principles in converting from Muslim to Christian dates.

Firstly, I have ascertained as far as possible the exact day or at least month of the year in question, and have taken this into account when converting; and Zambaur, though not Lane Poole, was careful to give the day and month wherever this was known to him. Secondly, where this exact information is lacking, I have simply taken the Christian year as the one in which the greater part of the Muslim year fell; and if the Muslim year began half-way through the Christian year (i.e. at the end of June or beginning of July), I have taken the Christian year as the one in which the first half of the Muslim year fell. The equivalents arrived at in this way are clearly not always going to be right, but this procedure seems to me in the present context preferable to the cumbersome citation of two Christian years. Thus I have written 741/1340 instead of the more exact 741/1340-1.

In putting together a book on Islamic chronology and genealogy, one encounters certain problems arising from the particular nature of the Arabic system of nomenclature.[4] The number of Arabic personal names is comparatively restricted, making confusion easy. Also, the complexity of the Arabic system of nomenclature poses problems in indexing: whether to enter a person under his patronymic (*kunya*), given name (*ism*), honorific title or nickname (*laqab*) or name indicating origin or profession (*nisba*)? In the text of the book, I have not given the known names and titles of each ruler in full; for these details, recourse must be made to Zambaur. The name or names given by me are generally those by which the ruler is best

known, together with any further components of his name necessary to distinguish him from other members of the dynasty; the procedure is to a certain extent arbitrary and selective, but necessary on grounds of space. Turkish and Mongol names, increasingly frequent after the eleventh century, when dynasties of Turkish military origin spread themselves all over the Islamic world from Algeria to the Yemen and Bengal, present a further difficulty. These names frequently appear in the Arabic script of the sources in deformed, sometimes barely recognisable shapes. Wherever ascertainable, I have set down what seems to be the correct Turkish or Mongol form, but where there is a considerable divergence between this form and the arabised one, I have noted the second form of the Arabic script in brackets, thus: Öljeytü (Ūljāytū), Hülegü (Hūlāgū), Temür (Tīmūr), Toghrīl (Ṭughrīl). Furthermore, where Ottoman Turkish pronunciation has produced forms of Arabic names which look markedly different from the standard transliteration of the Arabic originals, these are likewise noted, thus: 'Uthmān (Osman), Muḥammad (Mehmet), Bāyazīd (Bayezit). In the index of personal names (which in a book of this nature must be detailed if it is to be any good at all) I have entered separately all these alternative forms, with cross-references where necessary; and I have also put in such standard, Europeanised forms as Saladin and Avicenna.

Various scholars have given me the benefit of their specialist knowledge and have looked critically over appropriate sections of the book. They include Professor Aziz Ahmad (section on India), Dr A.D.H. Bivar (the Ṣaffārids), Prof. Cl. Cahen (Egypt, Syria and Iraq), Dr J.F.P. Hopkins (North Africa), Prof. R.M. Savory (modern Persia), and Mr J.R. Walsh (Anatolia). Dr George C. Miles, Chief Curator of the American Numismatic Society, was kind enough to send me a copy of his monograph *Coins of the Spanish Mulūk al-Ṭawā'if*, and Prof. E. Birnbaum made some useful suggestions regarding this Introduction. To all of these I am grateful, whilst at the same time assuming full responsibility for the book's shortcomings. Finally, may I record my appreciation of the extensive facilities afforded to the orientalist in the Library of the University of Toronto (where this book was put together during a year's stay as Visiting Professor), and my thanks to

the Edinburgh University Press for including the book in their Islamic Surveys series?

NOTES TO THE INTRODUCTION

1. E.g. A. M. H. J. Stockvis, *Manuel d'histoire, de généalogie et de chronologie de tous les états du globe* (3 vols., Leiden 1888-91); B. Spuler, ed., *Regenten und Regierungen der Welt*[2] (2 vols., Würzburg, Minister-Ploetz 1962); F. M. Powicke *et al.*, eds., *Handbook of British chronology*[2] (London, Royal Historical Society 1961).
2. The availability in Istanbul libraries of MSS of the Arabic original (on which see A. Dietrich, 'Textkritische Bemerkungen zu V. Minorsky's Studien zur kaukasischen Geschichte', *Orientalia*, N.S. XXVII [1958], 262-8) was not apparently known to Sachau.
3. These are accessible in several places, e.g. in the *Handbook of oriental history* (cited above), 33-40; in the booklets of Sir T. W. Haig, *Comparative tables of Muhammadan and Christian dates* (London 1932) and G. S. P. Freeman-Grenville, *The Muslim and Christian Calendars.* (London 1963); in H. G. Cattenoz, *Tables de concordance des ères chrétiennes et hégiriennes* (Rabat 1954); and in V. V. Tsybulskiy, *Sovremennye kalendari stran blizhnetsa i srednego vostoka. Sinkronisticheskie tablitsy i poyasneniya* (Moscow 1964). The fullest treatment is in F. Wüstenfeld-E. Mahler, *Vergleichungs-Tabellen zur muslimischen und iranischen Zeitrechnung*, 3rd edn. revised by J. Mayr and B. Spuler (Wiesbaden 1961).
4. The most extensive survey of the Arabic name and its various components is in L. Caetani and G. Gabrieli, *Onomasticon arabicum ossia repertorio alfabetico dei nomi di persona e di luogo contenuti nelle principali opere storiche, biografiche e geographiche, stampate e manoscritto, relative all' Islām.* I *Fonti – Introduzione* (Rome 1915).

THE ISLAMIC DYNASTIES

ONE

THE CALIPHS

⟨1⟩
The Orthodox or Rightly Guided Caliphs (Al-Khulafā' ar-Rāshidūn) 11-40/632-61

11/632	Abū-Bakr
13/634	'Umar b. al-Khaṭṭāb
23/644	'Uthmān b. 'Affān
35-40/656-61	'Alī b. Abī-Ṭālib
	Umayyad caliphs

On the Prophet's death in Medina in 11/632, four of his Companions, all of them close to him either through blood or through marriage, succeeded him as leaders of the Muslim *umma* or community. They assumed the title of *Khalīfa* or Caliph (literally, 'he who follows behind, successor'). Abū-Bakr was the father of Muḥammad's favourite wife 'Ā'isha, and one of his oldest and most trusted supporters; it was he who restored the authority of Medina over the outlying parts of the Arabian peninsula after the Bedouin tribes had renounced their personal allegiance to Muḥammad (the *Ridda* Wars). 'Umar also had a daughter who had been married to the Prophet, and it was under 'Umar's vigorous direction that the martial energies of the desert Arabs were turned against the Byzantine territories of Syria, Palestine, and Egypt and the Sāsānid ones of Persia and Iraq. 'Umar was also a great organiser, and both the introduction of a rudimentary civil administration into the conquered provinces and the invention of the Dīwān system for paying pensions to the Arab warriors are ascribed to him. It was also he who adopted the title *Amīr al-Mu'minīn* 'Com-

mander of the Faithful', implying a spiritual as well as purely political element in his leadership.

'Uthmān was the Prophet's son-in-law, and was elected caliph after 'Umar's murder by a small council of the leading Muslims, but his reign ended in a rebellion by discontented elements and his own death in 35/656. This assassination led to strife and counterstrife in the ensuing years, and for this reason it was later referred to as *al-Bāb al-maftūḥ* 'the door opened [to civil warfare]'. The last of the orthodox caliphs, 'Alī, was triply related to Muḥammad as his cousin, foster-brother, and son-in-law, and thus in the eyes of certain pious circles regarded as particularly well-fitted to succeed to the Prophet's heritage. But he was never able to enforce his authority in the territories of Mu'āwiya, governor of Syria (see below, p. 5). He moved his capital to Kūfa, attempted to rally the Arabs of Iraq to his side, and confronted Mu'āwiya in battle at Ṣiffīn on the upper Euphrates, but had no decisive success. After 'Alī was murdered in 40/661, his son al-Ḥasan half-heartedly tried to succeed him in Iraq, but was soon persuaded by Mu'āwiya to renounce all rights to the caliphate.

In later centuries, the period of the first four caliphs was regarded as a Golden Age in which the pristine Islamic virtues flourished, hence the title 'rightly guided' was applied to them, distinguishing them from the allegedly impious and worldly Umayyad caliphs who succeeded them.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Lane Poole, 3-5, 9; Zambaur, 3.

⟨2⟩

The Umayyad Caliphs
41-132/661-750

41/661	Mu'āwiya I b. Abī-Sufyān
60/680	Yazīd I
64/683	Mu'āwiya II
64/684	Marwān I b. al-Ḥakam
65/685	'Abd-al-Malik
86/705	al-Walīd I
96/715	Sulaimān
99/717	'Umar b. 'Abd-al-'Azīz
101/720	Yazīd II
105/724	Hishām
125/743	al-Walīd II
126/744	Yazīd III
126/744	Ibrāhīm
127-32/744-50	Marwān II al-Ḥimār
	'Abbāsid caliphs

Mu'āwiya followed 'Alī as caliph of the Muslims, having adopted the cry of 'Vengeance for 'Uthmān' against 'Alī (Mu'āwiya and 'Uthmān were kinsmen, both of them belonging to the Meccan clan of Umayya or 'Abd-Shams). Mu'āwiya had governed Syria for twenty years and had led the warfare against the Byzantines; consequently, he had a disciplined and well-trained army to set against the anarchic Bedouins who followed 'Alī.

The three greatest caliphs of the dynasty, Mu'āwiya, 'Abd-al-Malik, and Hishām, each reigned from Damascus for some twenty years, and were first class administrators of the empire which the Arabs had conquered. They were especially concerned to adapt and incorporate in their government the administrative practices of the Greeks and Persians whom the Arabs had supplanted, and the later Umayyad period sees the introduction of several Sāsānid techniques and manners, a process which was to be accelerated under the 'Abbāsids. The military conquests still proceeded apace, above all in the reign of al-Walīd I, although the Arab troops now had to campaign in remote, mountainous regions and in harsh climatic condi-

tions, and plunder did not come in as easily as at the outset of Arab expansion. All North Africa west of Egypt was occupied, and in 91/710 Muslim troops passed across the Straits of Gibraltar into Spain, later crossing the Pyrenees and raiding Carolingian France. Beyond the Caucasus, contact was made with the Turkish Khazars, and the Greek frontiers in eastern Anatolia were harried. In eastern Iran, Khwārazm was invaded and Transoxania slowly conquered for Islam against the strenuous opposition of the native Iranian rulers and their Turkish allies. Finally, an Arab governor penetrated through Makrān into Sind, implanting Islam for the first time on Indian soil. All these conquests had an important aspect in that they brought into the Islamic world large numbers of slaves; the use of this labour enabled the Arabs to live on the conquered lands as a rentier class and to exploit some of the economic potential of the rich Fertile Crescent.

Yet this administrative and economic progress did not prevent the fall of the Umayyad caliphate. The caliphs faced the sullen, insensate opposition of the Arab tribesmen of Iraq, and that of the pious elements centred on Medina, many of whom favoured the claims of ʿAlī's descendants, the Imāms of the Shīʿa (properly *Shīʿat ʿAlī*, 'party of ʿAlī'). Moreover, the masses of non-Arab peoples in the conquered territories, the *Mawālī*, were beginning to stir and to resent their position as second-class citizens. Hence the Umayyads were in 132/750 overthrown by a revolution which began in Khurasan or eastern Persia and which was led by an agitator of genius, Abū-Muslim. He exploited a wide variety of discontents to gain the caliphate for the ʿAbbāsids. In a general massacre of the Umayyads, one of the few members of the family to survive was Hishām's grandson ʿAbd-ar-Raḥmān; he escaped to North Africa and eventually founded in Spain a fresh line of Umayyads (see below, pp. 11-12).

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Lane Poole, 4-6, 9; Zambaur, 3 and Table F. EI[1] 'Umaiyads' (G. Levi della Vida).

⟨3⟩
The 'Abbāsid Caliphs

1. In Iraq and Baghdad 132-656/749-1258

132/749	as-Saffāḥ
136/754	al-Manṣūr
158/775	al-Mahdī
169/785	al-Hādī
170/786	Hārūn ar-Rashīd
193/809	al-Amīn
198/813	al-Ma'mūn
201-3/817-19	*Ibrāhīm b. al-Mahdī, in Baghdad*
218/833	al-Mu'taṣim
227/842	al-Wāthiq
232/847	al-Mutawakkil
247/861	al-Muntaṣir
248/862	al-Musta'īn
252/866	al-Mu'tazz
255/869	al-Muhtadī
256/870	al-Mu'tamid
279/892	al-Mu'taḍid
289/902	al-Muktafī
295/908	al-Muqtadir
320/932	al-Qāhir
322/934	ar-Rāḍī
329/940	al-Muttaqī
333/944	al-Mustakfī
334/946	al-Muṭī'
363/974	aṭ-Ṭā'i'
381/991	al-Qādir
422/1031	al-Qā'im
467/1075	al-Muqtadī
487/1094	al-Mustaẓhir
512/1118	al-Mustarshid
529/1135	ar-Rāshid
530/1136	al-Muqtafī
555/1160	al-Mustanjid
566/1170	al-Mustaḍī'
575/1180	an-Nāṣir
622/1225	aẓ-Ẓāhir

623/1226 al-Mustanṣir
640-56/1242-58 al-Musta'ṣim
Mongol sack of Baghdad

2. In Cairo 659-923/1261-1517

659/1261 al-Mustanṣir
660/1261 al-Ḥākim I
701/1302 al-Mustakfī I
740/1340 al-Wāthiq I
741/1341 al-Ḥākim II
753/1352 al-Mu'taḍid I
763/1362 al-Mutawakkil I *first time*
779/1377 al-Mu'taṣim, *first time*
779/1377 al-Mutawakkil I, *second time*
785/1383 al-Wāthiq II
788/1386 al-Mu'taṣim, *second time*
791/1389 al-Mutawakkil I, *third time*
808/1406 al-Musta'īn
816/1414 al-Mu'taḍid II
845/1441 al-Mustakfī II
855/1451 al-Qā'im
859/1455 al-Mustanjid
884/1479 al-Mutawakkil II
903/1497 al-Mustamsik, *first time*
914/1508 al-Mutawakkil III, *first time*
922/1516 al-Mustamsik, *second time*
923/1517 al-Mutawakkil III, *second time*
Ottoman conquest of Egypt

The 'Abbāsids came from the family of the Prophet's uncle al-'Abbās, of the Meccan clan of Hāshim, and because of this descent they were able to claim a legitimacy in the eyes of the pious which the Umayyads had lacked. Even so, the early 'Abbāsids had to contend with frequent revolts of the Alids, descendants of Muḥammad's son-in-law 'Alī, whom their partisans the Shī'a considered had an even better title to the caliphate, one based on a specific act of designation by the Prophet. In self-defence, the 'Abbāsids soon adopted a system of honorific titles (*alqāb* sing. *laqab*) on succession to the caliphate, a practice unknown to their Umayyad predecessors;

these titles proclaimed dependence on God and claimed divine support for 'Abbāsid rule. The theocratic nature of the 'Abbāsids' authority was emphasised in other ways, and the orthodox religious institution enlisted as far as possible on the side of the dynasty. It is possible that these trends owed something to older, Persian religio-political ideas, for the revolution of Abū-Muslim, which brought the 'Abbāsids to power, was essentially in origin a Persian movement; the transfer of the caliphal capital from Damascus to Baghdad symbolises the new eastwards orientation.

The Islamic empire virtually reached its full extent under the Umayyads, and under the early 'Abbāsids, the borders were almost static. Only a few of the caliphs distinguished themselves as practical soldiers—al-Ma'mūn and al-Mu'taṣim led successful expeditions into Anatolia against the Byzantines—and in the tenth and early eleventh centuries it was the Muslims who were forced on to the defensive by the vigorous Macedonian emperors. Already in the ninth century the political unity of the caliphate began to dissolve. A branch of the Umayyads ruled in Spain with complete independence, and North Africa was in general too distant to be controlled properly. In Egypt, the Ṭūlūnids enjoyed an autonomous status, whilst in Persia the Ṭāhirid governors were followed by local Iranian dynasties like the Sāmānids and Ṣaffārids, who paid some tribute to Baghdad but were otherwise left alone. The effective political power of the 'Abbāsids became reduced to Iraq, above all in the tenth century, when political Shī'ism triumphed over a large part of the Islamic world. The Fāṭimids seized first North Africa and then Egypt and Syria, proclaiming themselves rival caliphs in Cairo. In Iraq and Persia, the Daylamī Būyids rose to power, entering Baghdad in 334/945 and reducing the caliphs to the status of puppets, with almost nothing left but their moral and spiritual influence. The appearance of the Turkish Seljuqs in 447/1055 relieved the caliphs of this sectarian religious pressure, but the Seljuqs, despite their own strongly Sunnī views, did not intend to let the political power of the caliphs revive. It was only in the twelfth century, when the Great Seljuqs lost their solidarity and their power became enfeebled, that the fortunes of the 'Abbāsids began to rise under such competent caliphs as al-Muqtafī and an-Nāṣir. Unfortunately, this re-

covery was cut short by the Mongol cataclysm, and in 656/1258 Hülegü murdered the last caliph of Baghdad.

The first three centuries of ʿAbbāsid rule (eighth-eleventh centuries) saw the full flowering of mediaeval Islamic civilisation. Literature, theology, philosophy, and the natural sciences all flourished, with fertilising influences coming in from Persia and the Hellenistic world. Economic and commercial progress was widespread, above all in the older, long-settled lands of Persia, Iraq, and Egypt, and trade links were established with outside regions like the Eurasian steppes, the Far East, India, and black Africa. Despite the political breakdown and insecurity of the tenth century, this progress in the material and cultural fields continued, and it was in this regard quite apt for the Swiss orientalist Adam Mez to designate this period 'the Renaissance of Islam'. The incoming Turkish dynasties of the eleventh century and after were largely absorbed into the cultural fabric of Islam; it was the Mongols, for several decades fierce enemies of Islam and all that it stood for, who dealt really serious blows at this fabric.

The Baghdad caliphate was thus extinguished by the Mongols, but soon afterwards the Mamlūk sultan of Egypt, Baybars, decided himself to install a caliph, and invited an uncle of the last ʿAbbāsid of Baghdad, one of the few members of the family to escape massacre, to Cairo (659/1261). This caliph led an army and unsuccessfully tried to reconquer Baghdad, dying in the attempt, and a further ʿAbbāsid was installed the next year. This establishment of a caliph in Cairo served to legitimise Mamlūk rule, and was a moral weapon in the warfare against the crusaders and the Mongols; furthermore, the caliphs continued, as they had done in Baghdad, to act as heads of the *Futuwwa* or chivalric orders. But they had no practical power in the Mamlūk state, and there was certainly no idea of a division of power with the sultans. The last caliph, al-Mutawakkil III, was carried off to Istanbul in 923/1517 by Selīm the Grim, but the story that he then transferred his rights in the caliphate to the Ottoman sultans is a piece of fiction originating in the nineteenth century.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Lane Poole, 6-8, 12-13.
Zambaur, 4-5 and Table G; EI[2] "ʿAbbāsids' (B. Lewis).

TWO

SPAIN AND NORTH AFRICA

⟨4⟩
The Spanish Umayyads
138-422/756-1031

138/756 'Abd-ar-Raḥmān I ad-Dākhil
172/788 Hishām I
180/796 al-Ḥakam I
206/822 'Abd-ar-Raḥmān II al-Mutawassiṭ
238/852 Muḥammad I
273/886 al-Mundhir
275/888 'Abdallāh
300/912 'Abd-ar-Raḥmān III an-Nāṣir
350/961 al-Ḥakam II al-Mustanṣir
366/976 Hishām II al-Mu'ayyad, *first reign*
399/1009 Muḥammad II al-Mahdī, *first reign*
400/1009 Sulaymān al-Musta'īn, *first reign*
400/1010 Muḥammad II, *second reign*
400/1010 Hishām II, *second reign*
403/1013 Sulaymān, *second reign*
407/1016 Ḥammūdid 'Alī an-Nāṣir
408/1018 'Abd-ar-Raḥmān IV al-Murtaḍā
408/1018 Ḥammūdid al-Qāsim al-Ma'mūn, first time
412/1021 Ḥammūdid Yaḥyā al-Mu'talī, first time
413/1022 Ḥammūdid al-Qāsim, second time
414/1023 'Abd-ar-Raḥmān V al-Mustaẓhir
414/1024 Muḥammad III al-Mustakfī
416/1025 Ḥammūdid Yaḥyā, second time
418-22/1027-31 Hishām III al-Mu'tadd
Mulūk aṭ-Ṭawā'if

Arab and Berber troops crossed over the Straits of Gibraltar from Morocco to Spain in 92/711 and speedily overthrew the Visigoths, the Germanic military aristocracy who ruled Spain. During the next decades, they drove the remnants of the Visigoths into the Cantabrian Mts of the extreme north of the Iberian peninsula, and even penetrated across the Pyrenees into Frankish Gaul, until Charles Martel defeated them at Poitiers (or Tours) in 114/732. During these early years, Spain was ruled by a succession of Arab governors sent out from the east, but in 138/756 'Abd-ar-Raḥmān I, later called *ad-Dākhil* 'the Incomer', and one of the few Umayyads to have escaped slaughter in the 'Abbāsid revolution, appeared in Spain and founded the Umayyad Amīrate there.

In a peninsula where the facts of geography militate against central control and firm rule, the establishment of the Umayyads was an achievement indeed. The Amīrate was based on Seville and Cordova, but the Amīrs' hold on the provinces was less secure. Although a good proportion of the Hispano-Roman population became Muslim (the *Muwalladūn*), a substantial number remained Christians (the Mozarabs), and looked to the independent Christian north for moral and religious support. In particular, Toledo, the ancient capital of the Visigoths and the ecclesiastical centre of Spain, was a centre of rebelliousness. Amongst the Muslims, there were many local princes whose military strength as marcher lords enabled them to live virtually independently of the capital Cordova; these flourished above all in the Ebro valley of the north-east, the later Aragon and Catalonia (e.g. the Tujībids of Saragossa and the Banū-Qasī of Tudela). In the later ninth century, there were two centres of prolonged rebellion against the central government, one around Badajoz under Ibn-Marwān the Galician, and the other in the mountains of Granada under Ibn-Ḥafṣūn.

Despite these weaknesses, and despite the continued independence of the petty Christian kingdoms of the north, the Spanish Umayyads made Cordova a remarkable centre of trade and industrial production; and as a home of Arabic culture and learning, it was only inferior to Cairo and Baghdad. The tenth century is dominated by the greatest ruler of the dynasty, 'Abd-ar-Raḥmān III, called *an-Nāṣir* 'the Victorious', who

reigned for fifty years (300–50/912–61). He raised the power of the monarchy to a new pitch; court ceremonial was made more elaborate, possibly with Byzantine practice in mind, and 'Abd-ar-Raḥmān countered the pretensions of his enemies the Fāṭimids by himself adopting the titles of Caliph and Commander of the Faithful. The doctrine of orthodox legal theory, that the caliphate was one and indivisible, was thus clearly set aside. The army's strength was built up with fresh Berber recruits from Africa and with slave troops brought from all parts of Christian Europe (the *Ṣaqāliba*). The Christians of the north were humbled and an anti-Fāṭimid policy launched in North Africa. In the last years of the tenth century, real power in the state passed to the *Ḥājib* or chief minister, Ibn-Abī-'Āmir, called *al-Manṣūr* 'the Victorious' (the Almanzor of Christian sources); it was he who captured Barcelona and who sacked the shrine of St James of Compostella in Galicia.

Yet early in the eleventh century, for reasons which still remain rather mysterious, the Umayyad caliphate fell apart. A series of short-lived caliphates alternated with rule by members of the Ḥammūdid family, local rulers of Malaga and later of Algeciras. The Umayyads finally disappeared in 422/1031, and Muslim Spain fell into a period of political fragmentation, in the course of which various local princes and ethnic groups held power (the age of the *Mulūk aṭ-ṭawā'if* or Reyes de Taifas, see p. 14).

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Lane Poole, 19–22; Zambaur, 3–4 and Table F.

G. C. Miles, *The coinage of the Umayyads of Spain* (American Numismatic Society, Hispanic Numismatic Series: Monographs, No. 1, New York 1950).

⟨5⟩
The Mulūk aṭ-Ṭawā'if in Spain
Eleventh century

The half-century or so between the final collapse of the Umayyad caliphate and the coming of the Almoravids was one of political fragmentation accompanied, however, by great cultural brilliance. A number of local dynasties, enumerated at twenty-three by A. R. Nykl, seized power in the various parts of al-Andalus, some of these being mere city-states, others, like the Afṭasids in the south-west, ruling great tracts of territory. These dynasties were of varying race, reflecting the heterogeneousness of the military classes under the Umayyads and the ethnic tensions and rivalries amongst these groups. Some were pure Arab, like the 'Abbādids of Seville and the Hūdids of Saragossa. Others were Berber like the Miknāsa Afṭasids of Badajoz, the Hawwāra Dhū-n-Nūnids of Toledo (whose original name was the Berber one of Zennūn), and probably the Ḥammūdids of Malaga, even though the latter had become somewhat Arabised by the eleventh century and were tracing their descent through the Moroccan Idrīsids to the caliph 'Alī. Some of the Taifas sprang out of the great influx of troops from Africa which had taken place under al-Manṣūr at the end of the tenth century, such as the Ṣanhāja Berber Zīrids of Elvira; and a group of 'Āmirid clients and descendants of al-Manṣūr flourished in Valencia. In certain places of the south-east, e.g. in Tortosa, Denia, and initially at Valencia, military commanders of Ṣaqlabi origin seized power for a time.

The larger Taifas pursued aggressive policies at the expense of their neighbours. The 'Abbādids expanded almost to Toledo, and to further their designs at one stage resuscitated a man who claimed to be the last Umayyad caliph, Hishām III. Several of the Taifas were quite content to intrigue with or even call in the Christians against their fellow-Muslims; the last Afṭasid, 'Umar al-Mutawakkil, was ready to cede most of the territory he held in Portugal to Alfonso VI of Leon and Castile in return for help against the Almoravids.

Towards the end of the eleventh century, the tide was clearly beginning to flow against the Muslims in Spain. The religious classes reacted against the hedonism and irresponsibility of so

many of the local rulers, and were ready to accept the rule of the puritanical Berber Almoravids; as it happened, the Christians' capture of Toledo in 418/1085 made an appeal to the Almoravids by the 'Abbādid poet-king al-Mu'tamid inescapable.

The most important dynasties amongst the Mulūk aṭ-Ṭawā'if were as follows (for complete details, see Zambaur, 53-7 and Map 1):

Ḥammūdids in Malaga and Algeciras (400-49/1010-57)
'Abbādids in Seville (414-84/1023-91)
Zīrids in Granada (403-83/1012-90)
Banū-Yaḥyā in Niebla (414-43/1023-51)
Banū-Muzayn in Silves, Algarve (419-45/1028-53)
Banū-Razīn in Albarracin, La Sahla (402-c. 500/1011-c. 1107)
Banū-Qāsim in Alpuente (c. 420-85/c. 1029-92)
Jahwarids in Cordova (422-61/1031-69)
Afṭasids or Banū Maslama in Badajoz (413-87/1022-94)
Dhū-n-Nūnids in Toledo (before 419-78/before 1028-85)
'Āmirids in Valencia (412-89/1021-96)
Banū-Ṣumādiḥ in Almeria (c. 430-80/c. 1039-87)
Tujībids and then Hūdids in Saragossa, Lerida, Tudela, Calatayud, Denia, Tortosa (410-536/1019-1142)
Banū-Mujāhid and Banū-Ghāniya in Majorca (413-601/1022-1205)
Almoravid conquest of Muslim Spain 483/1090

1. Ḥammūdids of Malaga

400/1010 'Alī an-Nāṣir
407/1016 al-Qāsim I al-Ma'mūn, *first reign*
412/1021 Yaḥyā I al-Mu'talī, *first reign*
413/1023 al-Qāsim I, *second reign*
414/1023 Yaḥyā I, *second reign*
427/1036 Idrīs I al-Muta'ayyid
430/1039 Yaḥyā II
430/1039 al-Ḥasan al-Mustanṣir
434/1043 Idrīs II al-'Ālī, *first reign*
438/1046 Muḥammad I al-Mahdī
440/1048 Muḥammad II al-Mu'taṣim
440/1048 al-Qāsim II al-Wāthiq

446/1054	Idrīs III al-Muwaffaq
446/1054	Idrīs II, *second reign*
447-9/1055-7	Muḥammad III al-Musta'lī
	Conquest of the main branch in Malaga by the Zīrids of Granada, and of the cadet branch in Algeciras by the 'Abbādids in 450/1058

[N.B. the above table is based on that in Prieto y Vives (see bibliography), which differs considerably from that in Zambaur, 53-4]

2. 'Abbādids of Seville

414/1023	Muḥammad I b. 'Abbād
433/1042	'Abbād al-Mu'taḍid
461-84/1069-91	Muḥammad II al-Mu'tamid
	Almoravid conquest

3. Jahwarids of Cordova

422/1031	Jahwar
435/1043	Muḥammad ar-Rashīd
450-61/1058-69	'Abd-al-Malik
	'Abbādid conquest

4. Afṭasids of Badajoz

413/1022	'Abdallāh al-Manṣūr
437/1045	Muḥammad al-Muẓaffar
460-87/1068-94	'Umar al-Mutawakkil
	Almoravid conquest

5. Dhū-n-Nūnids of Toledo

?	'Abd-ar-Raḥmān b. Dhī-n-Nūn
419/1028	Ismā'īl aẓ-Ẓāfir
435/1043	Yaḥyā al-Ma'mūn
467-78/1075-85	Yaḥyā al-Qādir
	Conquest by Alfonso VI of Leon and Castile

6. 'Āmirids of Valencia

412/1021	'Abd-al-'Azīz al-Manṣūr
453/1061	'Abd-al-Malik al-Muẓaffar
457-68/1065-76	*Dhū-n-Nūnid occupation*

468/1076	Abū-Bakr
478/1085	al-Qāḍī 'Uthmān
478-83/1085-90	*Dhū-n-Nūnid Yaḥyā al-Qādir*
483-9/1090-6	al-Qāḍī Ja'far
	Conquest by El Cid and then by the Almoravids

7. Tujībids and Hūdids in Saragossa, etc.

Tujībids	
410/1019	Mundhir I al-Manṣūr
414/1023	Yaḥyā al-Muẓaffar
420/1029	Mu'izz-ad Dawla Mundhir II
Hūdids	
430/1039	Sulaymān al-Musta'īn
438/1046	Aḥmad I al-Muqtadir
474/1081	Yūsuf al-Mu'tamin
478/1085	Aḥmad II al-Musta'īn
503/1110	'Imād-ad-Dawla 'Abd-al-Malik } under Almoravid suzerainty
513-36/1119-42	Aḥmad III al-Mustanṣir } under Almoravid suzerainty
	Conquest by Alfonso I el Batallador and Ramiro II of Aragon

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Zambaur, 53-7; Lane Poole, 23-6.

A. Prieto y Vives, *Los Reyes de Taifas, estudio histórico-numismático de los Musulmanes españoles en el siglo V de la Hégira (XI de J.C.)* (Madrid 1926).

G. C. Miles, *Coins of the Spanish Mulūk al-Ṭawā'if* (American Numismatic Society, Hispanic Numismatic Series: Monographs, No. 3, New York 1954).

EI[1] 'Saragossa', 'Tudjīb (Banū)' (E. Lévi-Provençal).

EI[2] ''Abbādids', 'Afṭasids' (E. Lévi-Provençal); 'Dhu'l-Nūnids' (D.M. Dunlop); 'Djahwarids', 'Ḥammūdids' (A. Huici Miranda).

⟨6⟩
The Naṣrids or Banū-l-Aḥmar
627–897/1230–1492
Granada

629/1230	Muḥammad I al-Ghālib, called Ibn-al-Aḥmar
671/1272	Muḥammad II al-Faqīh
701/1302	Muḥammad III al-Makhlū'
708/1308	Naṣr
713/1313	Ismā'īl I
725/1325	Muḥammad IV
733/1333	Yūsuf I
755/1354	Muḥammad V al-Ghānī, *first reign*
760/1359	Ismā'īl II
761/1360	Muḥammad VI
763/1362	Muḥammad V, *second reign*
793/1391	Yūsuf II
797/1395	Muḥammad VII al-Musta'īn
810/1407	Yūsuf III
820/1417	Muḥammad VIII al-Mutamassik, *first reign*
831/1428	Muḥammad IX aṣ-Ṣaghīr
833/1430	Muḥammad VIII, *second reign*
835/1432	Yūsuf IV
835/1432	Muḥammad VIII, *third reign*
848/1444	Muḥammad X al-Aḥnaf
849/1445	Sa'd al-Musta'īn
850/1446	Muḥammad X, *second reign*
857/1453	Sa'd, *second reign*
866/1462	'Alī, *first reign*
887/1482	Muḥammad XI, (Boabdil), *first reign*
888/1483	'Alī, *second reign*
890/1485	Muḥammad XII az-Zaghall
892–7/1487–92	Muḥammad XI, *second reign*
	Spanish conquest

After the Almohads abandoned Spain, most of the Muslim cities fell speedily into the Christians' hands: Cordova fell in 635/1236 and Seville in 646/1248. One Muslim chief of Arab descent, Muḥammad al-Ghālib, managed to gain control of the

mountainous and easily-defensible province of Granada, and made the citadel of the town of Granada, known as the Alhambra (*al-Ḥamrā'* 'the red [fortress]'), his centre, agreeing to pay tribute first to Ferdinand I of Castile and then to his successor Alfonso X. The Naṣrid sultans tried to pursue a policy of balance between the Christians and the Marīnids of Fez, whose ambition it was to regain Spain for Islam; but Muslim hopes of successful Marīnid intervention were dashed by Sultan Abū-l-Ḥasan 'Alī's defeat by Alfonso XI of Castile at the Rio Salado in 741/1340.

Despite its precarious position, Granada remained for two and a half centuries a centre of Muslim civilisation, attracting scholars and literary men from all over the Muslim West. The historian Ibn-Khaldūn served as a diplomatist for Muḥammad VI; and in Vizier Lisān-ad-Dīn Ibn-al-Khaṭīb, whose history of Granada is a source of major importance, Naṣrid Granada produced a major literary figure. But the marriage of Ferdinand V of Aragon to Isabella of Castile in 1469 brought about the unification of Christian Spain under one crown, and the prospects for Granada's survival darkened. The Muslims in fact hastened their own end by refusing the customary tribute and by becoming embroiled in internal succession disputes, and in 897/1492 Granada fell to the Christians, the last Naṣrids fleeing to Morocco.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Lane Poole, 28-9; Zambaur, 58-9.

⟨7⟩

The Idrīsids

172-314/789-926

Morocco

172/789	Idrīs I
177/793	Idrīs II
213/828	Muḥammad al-Muntaṣir
221/836	'Alī I
234/849	Yaḥyā I
?	Yaḥyā II
?	'Alī II
?	Yaḥyā III al-Miqdām
292/905	Yaḥyā IV
310-14/922-6	al-Ḥasan al-Ḥajjām
	Fāṭimid conquest

The Idrīsids were the first dynasty who attempted to introduce the doctrines of Shī'ism, albeit in a very attenuated form, to the Maghrib; until their time, the region had been dominated by the radical equalitarianism of the Khārijīs. Idrīs I was a great-grandson of Caliph 'Alī's son al-Ḥasan, and thus connected with the line of Shī'ī Imāms. He took part in an Alid rising in the Ḥijāz against the 'Abbāsids in 169/786, and was compelled to flee to Egypt and then to North Africa, where the prestige of Alid descent led several Zenāta Berber chiefs of northern Morocco to recognise him as their leader. It seems to have been Idrīs I, and not his son Idrīs II, who began the building of Fez on the site of the old Roman town of Volubilis. It soon became populous, attracting emigrants from Muslim Spain and Ifriqiyya, and it became the Idrīsids' capital; its rôle as a holy city, home of the *Shorfā'* or privileged descendants of the Prophet's grandsons al-Ḥasan and al-Ḥusain, also begins now, and henceforth, the *Shorfā'* are an important factor in Moroccan history (see below, pp. 38-41). The Idrīsid period is also important for the diffusion of Islamic culture over the recently-converted Berber peoples of the interior.

However, during the reign of Muḥammad al-Muntaṣir the Idrīsid dominions became politically fragmented. Their various towns—the Idrīsids' hold in Morocco was essentially on the

towns rather than the countryside—were divided out as appanages to various of Muḥammad's many brothers. The Idrīsids thus fell prey to attacks from their Berber enemies, but in the tenth century a more determined and dangerous foe appeared in the shape of the Fāṭimids. Yaḥyā IV had to recognise the suzerainty of the Mahdī 'Ubaydallāh, and in 309/921 Fez was occupied by a Fāṭimid army. After this time, the rule of various other branches of the Idrīsids survived in outlying parts of Morocco, from Tamdult in the south to the home of the Ghomāra Berbers in the Rīf of northern Morocco, but the history of these lines is very obscure. The Idrīsids of the Rīf were threatened when the Spanish Umayyads initiated a forward policy in the Maghrib (*sc.* North Africa, 'the Western land') against their Fāṭimid enemies and seized Ceuta; and in 363/974 the last Idrīsids were carried off to Cordova. In the period of Umayyad decadence some three or four decades later, a distant branch of the Idrīsid family, the Ḥammūdids, obtained control of Algeciras and Malaga, and ruled there as one of the Taifas.

BIBLIOGRAPHY, Lane Poole, 35; Zambaur, 65 and Table A.
H. Terrasse, *Histoire du Maroc des origines à l'établissement du Protectorat français* (Casablanca 1949-50), I.

⟨8⟩
The Rustamids
160-296/777-909
Western Algeria

160/777	ʿAbd-ar-Raḥmān b. Rustam
168/784	ʿAbd-al-Wahhāb (or ʿAbd-al-Wārith) b. ʿAbd-ar-Raḥmān
208/823	Abū-Saʿīd Aflaḥ
258/872	Abū-Bakr b. Aflaḥ
?	Abū-l-Yaqẓān Muḥammad
281/894	Abū-Ḥātim Yūsuf, *first reign*
284/897	Yaʿqūb b. Aflaḥ
288/901	Abū-Ḥātim Yūsuf, *second reign*
294-6/907-9	Yaqẓān b. Muḥammad
	Capture of Tāhart by the Fāṭimid Dāʿī *Abū-ʿAbdallāh*

The Rustamids have an importance for the history of North African Islam quite disproportionate to the duration and extent of their political power. In the eighth century, the majority of the Berbers of North Africa adopted the radical, equalitarian religio-political sect of Khārijism as a protest against domination by their orthodox Arab masters. Whereas in the east, Khārijism was an extremist, savagely violent minority sect, in the west it was a mass movement and therefore more moderate. The Khārijī sub-sect of the Ibāḍiyya, the followers of one ʿAbdallāh b. Ibāḍ, had their original North African centre amongst the Zenāta Berbers of the Jebel Nefūsa in modern Tripolitania. After a temporary occupation of Qayrawān, the centre of orthodoxy and Arab power in the Maghrib, a group of Ibāḍiyya fled to western Algeria under the leadership of ʿAbdallāh b. Rustam, whose name would indicate Persian descent, and founded a Khārijī principality centred on Tāhart or Tīhart (modern Tiaret) (144/761). In 160/777 he became Imām of all the Ibāḍiyya in North Africa. This nucleus around Tāhart was linked with the Ibāḍī communities of the Aurès, southern Tunisia and Tripolitania, and groups as far south as the Fezzān oasis acknowledged the spiritual headship of the Rustamid Imāms. Surrounded as they were by enemies, the

Shīʿī Idrīsids on the west and the Sunnī Aghlabids on the east, the Rustamids sought the alliance of the Spanish Umayyads, and received subsidies from them. But the rise of the Shīʿī Fāṭimids in Morocco was fatal for the Rustamids, as for other local dynasties of the Maghrib. In 296/909 Tāhart fell to the Ketāma Berbers of the Fāṭimid *Dāʿī* or propagandist, Abū-ʿAbdallāh; many of the Rustamids were massacred, and the rest fled southwards to Wargla.

Tāhart under the Rustamids enjoyed a great material prosperity, being the northern terminus of one of the trans-Saharan caravan routes, and it acquired the name of 'Little Iraq'. It attracted a cosmopolitan population, amongst whom were appreciable Persian and Christian elements, and was a centre of scholarship. Its great historical rôle was as a rallying-point and nerve-centre for Khārijism throughout North Africa and even beyond; although it succumbed politically to the Fāṭimids, the Ibāḍī doctrines long remained potent in the Maghrib, and have indeed survived to this day in a few places like the Mzāb oasis in Algeria, the Tunisian island of Jerba, and in the Jebel Nefūsa.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Zambaur, 64; EI[1] 'Rustamids' (G. Marçais).
Chikh Békri, 'Le Kharijisme berbère: quelques aspects du royaume rustumide', *Annales de l'Institut d'Études Orientales*, XV (Algiers 1957), 55-108.

⟨9⟩
The Aghlabids
184-296/800-909
Ifriqiyya, Algeria, Sicily

184/800 Ibrāhīm I b. al-Aghlab
197/812 'Abdallāh I
210/817 Ziyādat-Allāh I
223/838 Abū-'Iqāl al-Aghlab
226/841 Muḥammad I
242/856 Aḥmad
249/863 Ziyādat-Allāh II
250/863 Abū-l-Gharānīq Muḥammad II
261/875 Ibrāhīm II
289/902 'Abdallāh II
290-6/903-9 Ziyādat-Allāh III
Fāṭimid conquest

Ibrāhīm b. al-Aghlab's father was a Khurasanian officer in the 'Abbāsid army, and in 184/800 the son was granted the province of Ifriqiyya (modern Tunisia) by Hārūn ar-Rashīd in return for an annual tribute of 40,000 dinars. The grant involved considerable rights of autonomy, and the great distance of North Africa from Baghdad ensured that none of the Aghlabids were much disturbed by the caliphal government. The first Aghlabids suppressed outbreaks of Berber Khārijism in their territories, and then under Ziyādat-Allāh I, one of the most capable and energetic members of the family, the great project of the conquest of Sicily from the Byzantines was begun in 217/827. An extensive corsair fleet was launched, making the Aghlabids supreme in the central Mediterranean and enabling them to harry the coasts of southern Italy, Sardinia, Corsica, and even of the Maritime Alps. Malta was captured in 255/868. It is probable that the conquest of Sicily was begun in order to divert fanatical energies into *jihād* against the infidels, for the early Aghlabids had had to cope with strong internal opposition in Ifriqiyya from the Mālikī *fuqahā'* or religious leaders in Qayrawān (Cairouan). By 264/878 the conquest of Sicily was virtually complete, and the island remained under Muslim rule, at first under Aghlabid and then under Fāṭimid governors, until

the Norman conquest of the later eleventh century, forming an important centre for the diffusion of Islamic culture to Christian Europe. The Aghlabids were also enthusiastic builders; Ziyādat-Allāh I rebuilt the Great Mosque of Qayrawān, and Aḥmad that of Tunis, and useful agricultural and irrigation works were constructed, especially in the less fertile south of Ifriqiyya.

However, the Aghlabids' position in Ifriqiyya deteriorated towards the end of the ninth century. The Shīʿī propaganda of Abū-ʿAbdallāh, the precursor of the Fāṭimid Mahdī ʿUbaydallāh, had a powerful effect amongst the Ketāma Berbers; this burst out into a military rising, and the last Aghlabid Ziyādat-Allāh III was driven out to Egypt in 296/909, after fruitless attempts to secure help from the ʿAbbāsids.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Lane Poole, 36-8; Zambaur, 67-8.
EI² 'Aghlabids' (G. Marçais).

⟨10⟩
The Zīrids and Ḥammādids
361–547/972–1152
Ifriqiyya and eastern Algeria

1. Zīrids

361/972	Yūsuf Buluggīn I b. Zīrī
373/984	al-Manṣūr b. Buluggīn
386/996	Nāṣir-ad-Dawla Bādīs
406/1016	Sharaf-ad-Dawla al-Mu'izz
454/1062	Tamīm
501/1108	Yaḥyā
509/1116	'Alī
515–43/1121–48	al-Ḥasan
	Norman and then Almohad conquest

2. Ḥammādids

405/1015	Ḥammād b. Buluggīn I b. Zīrī
419/1028	al-Qā'id
446/1054	Muḥsin
447/1055	Buluggīn II
454/1062	an-Nāṣir
481/1088	al-Manṣūr
498/1105	Bādīs
498/1105	al-'Azīz
515 *or* 518–47/ 1121 *or* 1124–52	Yaḥyā
	Almohad conquest

The Zīrids were Ṣanhāja Berbers inhabiting the central part of the Maghrib, who early identified themselves with the Fāṭimid cause, bringing military relief to the Fāṭimid capital al-Mahdiyya when in 334/945 it was besieged by the Khārijī rebel Abū-Yazīd. Accordingly, when the Fāṭimid caliph, al-Mu'izz, left for Egypt, he appointed Buluggīn b. Zīrī governor of Ifriqiyya. The latter kept up the traditional enmity of his people with the nomadic Zenātas, and overran all the Maghrib as far as Ceuta. These possessions proved too unwieldy for one man to govern, and under Buluggīn's grandson Bādīs a *divisio imperii* was made: the western regions went to the Ḥammādid

branch of the family, and these made their capital at Qal'at Banī-Ḥammād, whilst the Zīrid main branch retained Ifriqiyya with its capital Qayrawān.

The rich resources and wealth of Ifriqiyya tempted the Zīrid al-Mu'izz to rebel against his Fāṭimid overlords, and in 433/1041 he transferred his allegiance to the 'Abbāsids (the Ḥammādids, however, remained faithful to the Fāṭimids at this time). Hence shortly afterwards, the Fāṭimids released against the Zīrids bands of unassimilated, barbarian Bedouins of the Hilāl and Sulaym tribes, who migrated from Lower Egypt to the Maghrib. These Arabs gradually worked their way across the countryside, terrorising the towns, and forcing the Zirids to evacuate Qayrawān for al-Mahdiyya on the coast and the Ḥammādids to withdraw to the less accessible port of Bougie. Having lost control of the land, they now turned to the sea and built up a fleet; it is, indeed, this period which inaugurates the age of the Barbary corsairs. But they were unable to prevent Muslim Sicily falling to the Normans, even though peaceful commercial relations were later established with the Norman kings. However, in the twelfth century, the Zirids were hard pressed; Roger II of Sicily captured al-Mahdiyya and the Tunisian coast, forcing al-Ḥasan to pay tribute, and soon afterwards the Zīrid and Ḥammādid territories passed to the Almohads.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Lane Poole, 39-40; Zambaur, 70-1.
EI[1] 'Zīrids' (G. Marçais).
H. R. Idris, *La Berbérie orientale sous les Zīrides X^e-XII^e siècles*, 2 vols. (Paris 1962), with detailed genealogical and chronological tables, making many corrections to Zambaur.

⟨11⟩
The Almoravids or al-Murābiṭūn
448-541/1056-1147
North Africa and Spain

?	Yaḥyā b. Ibrāhīm	chiefs of the Ṣanhāja Berbers recognising the spiritual authority of 'Abdallāh b. Yāsīn
?	Yaḥyā b. 'Umar	
448-80/1056-73	Abū-Bakr al-Lamtūnī	
453/1061	Yūsuf b. Tāshufīn	
500/1106	'Alī	
537/1142	Tāshufīn	
540/1146	Ibrāhīm	
540-1/1146-7	Is'ḥāq	
	Almohad conquest	

The Almoravids arose from one of the waves of spiritual exaltation which have at various times in the history of the Maghrib come over the Berber peoples. In the early part of the eleventh century, the Ṣanhāja chief Yaḥyā b. Ibrāhīm made the Pilgrimage to Arabia; he became filled with enthusiasm, and on his return invited a noted Moroccan scholar, 'Abdallāh b. Yāsīn, to work amongst his people. A *ribāṭ* or fortress was built at the mouth of the Senegal River, and from here warriors for the faith spread a simple, fundamentalist form of Islam through the western Sudan. These warriors were known as *Murābiṭūn*, literally 'those dwelling in the frontier fortresses', and the term has given us the Spanish form *Almoravides* and the French word *marabout* 'holy man, local saint'. These Berbers of the desert wore veils over their faces, as do their modern descendants of the Tuaregs, and were hence also known as *al-Mutalaththimūn* 'the veiled ones'. Led by Abū-Bakr and his lieutenant Yūsuf b. Tāshufīn, they moved northwards against Morocco and conquered North Africa as far as Algiers. Yūsuf now founded Marrākesh as his capital (454/1062). The Almoravids recognised the 'Abbāsid caliphs as spiritual heads of Islam, and followed the conservative Mālikī law school, dominant in Muslim North Africa.

Muslim Spain was at this time in the fragmented condition of the age of the *Mulūk aṭ-Ṭawā'if*, and now that the Christian

Reconquista was beginning, it became clear that only the rising power of the Almoravids could save the divided and squabbling princelings there. Yūsuf b. Tāshufīn crossed over from Africa in 479/1086 and won a great victory over Alfonso VI of Leon and Castile at Zallāqa near Badajoz, which, however, he regrettably failed to follow up, and Toledo remained in Christian hands. Over the next few years, Yūsuf suppressed almost all the Taifas, only the Hūdids being allowed to remain in Saragossa. But in the early years of the twelfth century, the Almoravid position in the Maghrib was threatened by the rise there of a fresh power, that of the Almohads (see pp. 30-1); it was because of this pressure in the rear that the Almoravids were unable to save Saragossa from the Christians in 512/1118. In 541/1147 the last Almoravid ruler in Marrākesh, Is'ḥāq, was killed, and the Almohads began crossing to Spain. When the last Almoravid governor in Spain, Yaḥyā b. Ghāniya, whose family was related by marriage to the Almoravids, died in 543/1148, their power was ended, but the post-Almoravid line of the Banū-Ghāniya continued in Majorca from its conquest in 509/1115 till the Aragonese occupation of 625/1228, and in Minorca as vassals of Aragon till 685/1286.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Lane Poole, 41-4; Zambaur, 73-4.
EI[1] 'Almoravids' (A. Bel).
EI[2] 'Ghāniya, Banū' (G. Marçais).

⟨12⟩

The Almohads or al-Muwaḥḥidūn
524-667/1130-1269
North Africa and Spain

	Muḥammad b. Tūmart, d. 524/1130
524/1130	'Abd-al-Mu'min
558/1163	Abū-Ya'qūb Yūsuf I
580/1184	Abū-Yusūf Ya'qūb al-Manṣūr
595/1199	Muḥammad an-Nāṣir
611/1214	Abū-Ya'qūb Yūsuf II al-Mustanṣir
620/1224	'Abd-al-Wāḥid I al-Makhlū'
621/1224	Abū-Muḥammad 'Abdallāh al-'Ādil
624/1227	Yaḥyā al-Mu'taṣim
626/1229	Abū-l- 'Alā' Idrīs al-Ma'mūn
630/1232	Abū-Muḥammad 'Abd-al-Wāḥid II ar-Rashīd
640/1242	Abū-l-Ḥasan 'Alī- as-Sa'īd al-Mu'taḍid
646/1248	Abū-Ḥafs 'Umar al-Murtaḍā
665-7/1266-9	Abū-l-'Ulā al-Wāthiq
	Christian conquest of all Spain except Granada; North African lands divided amongst 'Abd-al-Wādids, Ḥafṣids and Marīnids

The Almohads (from *al-Muwaḥḥidūn* 'those who affirm God's unity') represented, intellectually, a protest against the rigidly conservative and legalistic Mālikism prevalent in North Africa and against the social laxity of life under the later Almoravids. Their founder, the Berber Ibn-Tūmart, had studied in the east and had acquired ascetic, reforming views. After receiving the homage of the Maṣmūda Berber chiefs of Morocco, he put himself at the head of a mass movement, proclaiming himself the Mahdī or Promised Charismatic Leader. His lieutenant, 'Abd-al-Mu'min, later styled himself Ibn-Tūmart's caliph or representative. The Almohads gradually took over Morocco, extinguishing the Almoravids there and making Marrākesh their own capital. In Spain, there was a vacuum of power after the decline of the Almoravids, in which some local groups like the Taifas of the previous century reappeared (e.g. in Valencia,

Cordova and Murcia); then in 540/1145 'Abd-al-Mu'min despatched an army to Spain and soon occupied all the Muslim territory there. A powerful Almohad kingdom, now with its capital at Seville, was constituted; 'Abd-al-Mu'min conquered as far as Tunis and Tripoli, and the Ayyūbid Saladin sought his alliance and naval assistance against the Franks. The structure of the Almohad state reflected the Messianic, authoritarian nature of Ibn-Tūmart's original teaching, and was built round a close-knit hierarchy of the caliph's advisers and intimates. The court was a splendid centre of art and learning, above all for the last flowering of Islamic philosophy associated with such scholars as Ibn-Ṭufayl and Ibn-Rushd (Averroes), both of whom acted as court physicians to the Almohad sultans.

Yet the Almohads could not hold up the Christian advance permanently. A victory at Alarcos in 591/1195 had no lasting effect, and the catastrophic defeat of Las Navas de Tolosa in 609/1212 at the hands of a coalition of the Christian kings of the peninsula, resulted in the withdrawal of the Almohads from Spain altogether. The last sultans reigned only in North Africa, but there too their grip began to loosen. The rising of Yaghamrāsan b. Zayyān at Tlemcen in 633/1236 led to the foundation there of the independent 'Abd-al-Wādid dynasty; and in the next year, Abū-Zakariyā' Yaḥyā, the governor of Ifriqiyya, proclaimed his independence in Tunis and founded the dynasty of the Ḥafṣids. Finally, the Almohad capital Marrākesh itself fell to the Marīnids in 667/1269.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Lane Poole, 45-7; Zambaur, 73-4.
EI[1] 'Almohads' (A. Bel).
A. Huici Miranda, *Historia política del imperio Almohade*, 2 vols. (Tetuan 1956-7).

⟨13⟩
The Marīnids and Waṭṭāsids
592-956/1196-1549
Morocco

1. Line of Marīnids

592/1196 Abū-Muḥammad ʿAbd al-Ḥaqq I
614/1217 ʿUthmān I
637/1240 Muḥammad I
642/1244 Abū-Yaḥyā Abū-Bakr
656/1258 Abū-Yūsuf Yaʿqūb
685/1286 Abū-Yaʿqūb Yūsuf
706/1307 Abū-Thābit ʿĀmir
708/1308 Abū-r-Rabīʿ Sulaymān
710/1310 Abū-Saʿīd ʿUthmān II
732/1331 Abū-l-Ḥasan ʿAlī *I*
749/1348 Abū-ʿInān Fāris
759/1359 Muḥammad II as-Saʿīd
760/1359 Abū-Sālim ʿAlī *II*
762/1361 Abū-ʿUmar Tāshufīn
763/1361 ʿAbd-al-Ḥalīm (at first in Fez, then in Sijilmāsa)
763/1362 Abū-Zayyān Muḥammad III
768/1366 Abū-l-Fāris ʿAbd-al-ʿAzīz I
774/1372 Abū-Zayyān Muḥammad IV
776/1374 Abū-l-ʿAbbās Aḥmad, *first reign*
786/1384 Mūsā
788/1386 Abū-Zayyān Muḥammad V
788/1386 Muḥammad VI
789/1387 Abū-l-ʿAbbās Aḥmad, *second reign*
796/1393 Abū-l-Fāris
799/1397 ʿAbd-al-ʿAzīz II
800/1398 ʿAbdallāh
801/1399 Abū-Saʿīd ʿUthmān III
823-31/1420-8 interregnum of the Zayyānid or ʿAbd-al-Wādid of Tlemcen, Abū-Malik ʿAbd-al-Wāḥid
831-69/1428-65 Abū-Muḥammad ʿAbd-al-Ḥaqq II

2. Line of Waṭṭāsids

831/1428	Abū-Zakariyā' Yaḥyā	Regents for the Marīnid 'Abd-al-Ḥaqq II
852/1448	'Alī	
863/1459	Muḥammad I ash-Shaykh	
875/1470	Muḥammad II al-Burtuqālī	
931/1525	Aḥmad, *first reign*	
952/1545	Muḥammad III al-Qasrī	
954-6/1547-9	Aḥmad, *second reign*	
	Sa'dī Sharīfs	

The Marīnids succeeded to the heritage of the Almohads in Morocco and the central Maghrib, dividing up their territories with the Ḥafṣids of Tunisia. The Banū-Marīn were a tribe of the nomadic Zenāta Berbers; their cultural level was probably low, and they were uninspired in their bid for power by any of the religious enthusiasm which had given driving power to the conquests of the Almoravids and Almohads. These facts, together with what seem to have been comparatively small numbers, doubtless account for the protracted nature of their struggles with the last Almohads. They first invaded Morocco from the Sahara in 613/1216, but were halted by the Almohad Abū-Sa'īd and did not secure Marrākesh till 669/1269 and Sijilmāsa till four years later.

Established with their capital at Fez, the Marīnids acquired a strong sense of being heirs to the Almohads, and attempted to rebuild their empire in the Maghrib. They were also inspired with the spirit of *jihād* and dreamed of the reconquest of Spain; the Marīnid period does, indeed, see a great growth of maraboutism and popular religious fervour. Several Marīnid sultans fought personally in Spain. Abū-Yusūf Ya'qūb crossed over in answer to an appeal from the Naṣrids of Granada and won the battle of Ecija in 674/1275. After the Spanish capture of Gibraltar in 709/1309, Marīnid troops again appeared in Spain, but Abū-l-Ḥasan 'Alī was routed at the Rio Salado in 741/1340 by the forces of Alfonso XI of Castile and Alfonso IV of Portugal, and the Marīnids never again tried to interfere in Spain. In North Africa, the Marīnids wore down their neighbours the 'Abd-al-Wādids of Tlemcen, occupying their capital

in 737/1337 and at later dates, but they were unable to dislodge the Ḥafṣids from Tunisia.

Towards the end of the fourteenth century, the decline of the Marīnids began to be apparent. In 803/1401 Henry III of Castile attacked Tetuan and in 818/1415 the Portuguese took Ceuta, and this Christian aggressiveness caused a great wave of religious sentiment in the Maghrib and calls for *jihād* against the infidels. This reaction facilitated the assumption of *de facto* power by the Banū-Waṭṭās, a collateral branch of the Marīnids who had already attained high office under the sultans. Abū-Zakariyā' Yaḥyā at first ruled as regent for the young Marīnid 'Abd-al-Ḥaqq II, and set to work combatting the Portuguese. 'Abd-al-Ḥaqq tried in 862/1458 to rule directly, but was assassinated seven years later. The Waṭṭāsid Muḥammad I ash-Shaykh was proclaimed sultan in Fez in 877/1472, seizing the city from the Idrīsid *Shorfā'*. But the later Waṭṭāsids were unable to withstand the growing power of the Sa'dī Sharīfs, who finally occupied Fez in 956/1549; an attempted Waṭṭāsid revanche with Ottoman Turkish help failed, and the dynasty was permanently extinguished.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Lane Poole, 57-9; Zambaur, 79.
EI[1] 'Merīnids' (G. Marçais), 'Waṭṭāsids' (E. Lévi-Provençal).
H. de Castries, ed., *Les sources inédites de l'histoire du Maroc de 1530 à 1845*, Series I, *Dynastie Saadienne 1530-1660*, Vol. IV, Part I (Paris-Madrid 1921), with detailed genealogical table of the Waṭṭāsids at pp. 162-3.
H. Terrasse, *Histoire du Maroc*, II.

⟨14⟩
The Ḥafṣids
625-982/1228-1574
Tunisia and eastern Algeria

625/1228 Abū-Zakariyā' Yaḥyā I
647/1249 Abū-'Abdallāh Muḥammad I al-Muntaṣir
675/1277 Abū-Zakariyā' Yaḥyā II al-Wāthiq
678/1279 Abū-Is'ḥāq Ibrāhīm I
681/1282 usurpation of Aḥmad b. Abī-'Umāra
683/1284 Abū-Ḥafṣ 'Umar I (in Tunis)
684/1285 Abū-Zakariyā' Yaḥyā III al-Muntakhab (in Bougie and Constantine till 689/1299)
694/1295 Abū-'Abdallāh (or Abū-'Aṣīda) Muḥammad II al-Muntaṣir
709/1309 Abū-Yaḥyā Abū-Bakr I ash-Shahīd
709/1309 Abū-l-Baqā' Khālid I an-Nāṣir
711/1311 Abū-Yaḥyā Zakariyā' I al-Liḥyānī (in Tunis)
717/1317 Abū-Ḍarba Muḥammad III al-Mustanṣir al-Liḥyānī (in Tunis)
718/1318 Abū-Yaḥyā Abū-Bakr II al-Mutawakkil
747/1346 Abū-Ḥafṣ 'Umar II
748/1348 first Marīnid occupation of Tunis
750/1349 Abū-l-'Abbās Aḥmad I al-Faḍl al-Mutawakkil (in Tunis)
750/1350 Abū-Is'ḥāq Ibrāhīm II al-Mustanṣir, *first reign*
758/1357 second Marīnid occupation of Tunis
758/1357 Abū-Is'ḥāq Ibrāhīm II, *second reign* (in Tunis till 770/1369; other Ḥafṣid princes in Bougie and Constantine)
770/1369 Abū-l-Baqā' Khālid II (in Tunis)
772/1370 Abū-l-'Abbās Aḥmad II al-Mustanṣir (previously in Bougie and Constantine)
796/1394 Abū-Fāris 'Abd-al-'Azīz al-Mutawakkil
837/1434 Abū-'Abdallāh Muḥammad IV al-Muntaṣir

839/1435 Abū-ʻUmar ʻUthmān
893/1488 Abū-Zakariyā' Yaḥyā IV
894/1489 ʻAbd-al-Mu'min
895/1490 Abū-Yaḥyā Zakariyā' II
899/1494 Abū-ʻAbdallāh Muḥammad V al-Mutawakkil
932/1526 Abū-ʻAbdallāh Muḥammad al-Ḥasan, *first reign*
941/1534 first Turkish conquest of Tunis by Khayr-ad-Dīn Barbarossa
942/1535 al-Ḥasan, *second reign* (as vassal of the Emperor Charles V)
950/1543 Aḥmad III
977/1569 second Turkish conquest of Tunis by ʻUlūj ʻAlī
981/1573 Abū-ʻAbdallāh Muḥammad VI (as a vassal of Spain)
982/1574 third and definitive Turkish conquest of Tunis by Sinān Pasha

The Ḥafṣids, the most important dynasty in the history of late mediaeval Ifriqiyya, derived their name from Shaykh Abū-Ḥafṣ ʻUmar (d. 571/1176), a disciple of the founder of the Almohad movement, Ibn-Tūmart, and one of ʻAbd-al-Mu'-min's generals. His offspring filled various important offices under the Almohads, including the governorship of Ifriqiyya. One of these Ḥafṣid governors, Abū-Zakariyā' Yaḥyā I, in 634/1237 threw off the authority of the Almohad caliph, ʻAbd-al-Wāḥid, alleging as a pretext for this the latter's unorthodox innovations. He now expanded westwards into the central Maghrib, taking Constantine, Bougie, and Algiers, making the ʻAbd-al-Wādids of Tlemcen his tributaries, compelling the Marīnids to acknowledge him and receiving appeals for help from the beleaguered Muslims of southern Spain. The power of the Ḥafṣids was equally great under his son al-Muntaṣir, who repelled the attack of Louis IX of France and Charles of Anjou (668/1270) and assumed the titles of Caliph and *Amīr al-Mu'minīn*, obtaining these titles from the Sharīf of Mecca and claiming to be the heir of the Baghdad ʻAbbāsids.

The century and a half after al-Muntaṣir's death was filled

with violent fluctuations in Ḥafṣid power and stability, with the towns of the central Maghrib and of southern Ifriqiyya and the Jarīd region there tending to throw off Ḥafṣid control during periods of weak rule. At times there were several contestants for the Ḥafṣid throne, with claimants ruling in various towns. In the sixteenth century, the dynasty was in clear decline, their authority often being limited to the region of Tunis itself. The establishment of the Turks in Algiers and other ports, and the Ḥafṣids' inability to control these corsair depredations, invited attacks and reprisals by the Christians. The Emperor Charles v planted a Spanish garrison at Tunis in 941/1535. The last Ḥafṣids retained a precarious authority with Spanish help against the Turks, but in 981/1574 Sinān Pasha finally took Tunis, and the last Ḥafṣid was carried off captive to Istanbul.

Tunis under the Ḥafṣids enjoyed a great resurgence in prosperity. Before the disruptive activity of the Barbary corsairs caused a deterioration in relations, the Ḥafṣids had extensive commercial treaties with the Italian and southern French towns and with Aragon. The land benefited also from the influx of Spanish Muslim refugees (amongst whom were the historian Ibn-Khaldūn's forebears). Tunis became a great artistic and intellectual centre, and it was the Ḥafṣids who in the thirteenth century introduced the madrasa system of education previously known in the lands to the east.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Lane Poole, 49-50, 52-3; Zambaur, 74-6.
EI[2] 'Ḥafṣids' (H. R. Idris).
R. Brunschvig, *La Berbérie orientale sous les Ḥafṣides des origines à la fin du XV[e] siècle*, 2 vols. (Paris 1940-7).

⟨15⟩
The Sharīfs of Morocco
917- /1511-

1. Sa'dīs

917/1511	Muḥammad al-Mahdī al-Qā'im-bi-amr-Allāh (in Sūs)	
923/1517	Aḥmad al-A'raj (in Marrākesh till 947/1540)	
923/1517	Muḥammad ash-Shaykh al-Mahdī b. Muḥammad al-Mahdī (at first in Sūs, later in Fez)	
964/1557	'Abdallāh al-Ghālib	
981/1574	Muḥammad al-Mutawakkil al-Maslūkh	
983/1576	'Abd-al-Malik b. Muḥammad ash-Shaykh al-Mahdī	
986/1578	Aḥmad al-Manṣūr	
1012-17/1603-8	Muḥammad ash-Shaykh al-Ma'mūn	sons of Aḥmad, in rivalry for the succession
1012-17/1603-8	'Abdallāh al-Wāthiq (in Marrākesh)	
1012-39/1603-28	Zaydān an-Nāṣir (at first, in Fez only)	
1034/1623	'Abd-al-Malik b. Zaydān	in Marrākesh only
1042/1631	al-Walīd	
1045/1636	Muḥammad al-Aṣghar	
1064-9/1654-9	Aḥmad al-'Abbās	

2. Filālīs

1041/1631	Muḥammad I ash-Sharīf (in Tāfilālt)
1045/1635	Muḥammad II b. Muḥammad
1075/1664	ar-Rashīd
1082/1672	Ismā'īl as-Samīn
1139/1727	Aḥmad adh-Dhahabī
1141/1729	'Abdallāh
1147-58/1735-45	*'Abdallāh's power contested by various usurpers and pretenders*
1171/1757	Muḥammad III b. 'Abdallāh
1204/1790	Yazīd
1206/1792	Hishām

1207/1793	Sulaymān
1238/1822	'Abd-ar-Raḥmān
1276/1859	Muḥammad IV b. 'Abd-ar-Raḥmān
1290/1873	al-Ḥasan I b. Muḥammad
1312/1895	'Abd-al-'Azīz
1325/1907	al-Ḥāfiẓ
1330/1912	Yūsuf
1345/1927	Muḥammad V b. Yūsuf, *first reign*
1372/1953	Muḥammad b. 'Arafa
1375/1955	Muḥammad V, *second reign*
1381- /1962-	al-Ḥasan II b. Muḥammad

From mediaeval times onwards, the *Shorfā'* of Morocco (classical form *Shurafā'*, sing. *Sharīf*) have played an outstanding part in the country's history. The Maghrib has often been receptive to the leadership of messianic or charismatic figures, and some of the most characteristic forms of popular Islam there have been the cult of holy men, saints and marabouts (< *murābit*, see above, p. 28), and the formation of religious fraternities organised round the religio-military centres of the *zāwiyas*. The strength of maraboutism and the rise to social pre-eminence of the *Shorfā'* have been especially characteristic of Moroccan Islam, for Morocco, with its Atlantic seaboard and its proximity to Spain and Portugal, has borne the brunt of Christian attacks, and the Muslim reaction has been commensurately intense.

The *Sharīfs* are the descendants in general of the Prophet, but in Morocco, most of the lines of *Shorfā'* have traced descent from the Prophet's grandson al-Ḥasan b. 'Alī, and the Sa'dīs and Filālīs specifically traced their descent through al-Ḥasan's grandson Muḥammad an-Nafs az-Zakiyya (d. 145/762). The Idrīsids (see above, pp. 20-1) were the first line of *Sharīfs* to achieve power in Morocco, but in ensuing centuries various Berber dynasties were dominant there. However, the chance of the *Shorfā'* came in the sixteenth century when the Waṭṭāsids' power in Fez was clearly waning. From a base in the Sūs region of southern Morocco, the Sa'dī line of *Shorfā'* – who had come from Arabia in the later fourteenth century – gradually extended their power northwards, expelling the Waṭṭāsids from Fez in 956/1549. The full name and titles of the founder of the line's fortunes, Muḥammad al-Mahdī al-Qā'im-bi-amr-Allāh, show

how messianic expectations and feelings of religious exaltation and *jihād* against the Christians, were utilised by the early Saʿdīs. Their authority was now imposed over almost the whole of Morocco, and the *Bilād al-Makhzen*, the area where the government's writ ran and where taxation and troops were raised, reached its maximum extent. The Turks of Algiers and the Portuguese in the coastlands were repulsed; and Aḥmad al-Manṣūr occupied Timbuctu and destroyed the African kingdom of Gao (on the Niger, in the modern republic of Mali), so that his authority extended for a time from Senegal to Bornu. The social and fiscal privileges of the *Shorfā'* were now further consolidated and confirmed by each new sultan on his accession.

However, the unity of the sultanate weakened in the seventeenth century, when independence movements appeared in various parts of Morocco, and the last Saʿdīs disappeared, despite English and Dutch help, by 1069/1659. The total disintegration of Morocco was prevented by the Filālī *Shorfā'* of Tāfilālt in eastern Morocco, whose leaders Maulāy ar-Rashīd and Maulāy Ismāʿīl (*Maulāy* = 'My lord') restored *Sharīfī* authority all through the land and built up a large standing army, which included a force of black slaves, *ʿAbīd al-Bukhārī* or *al-Bawākhir*. In the eighteenth century, the last foothold of the Portuguese was eliminated, and trade treaties were made with the northern European powers; but in the nineteenth century, any foreign penetration of Morocco was discouraged. Nevertheless, internal disorder grew in this period, and Morocco fought two disastrous wars against the French (1260/1844) and the Spanish (1277/1859-60). The French protectorate proclaimed in 1330/1912 saved Morocco from anarchy and from possible dismemberment by the European powers, although the conquest of the country by the French on the sultan's behalf took some twenty years. Finally, in 1375/1956 Morocco threw off the protected status and became once more independent, with the Filālī dynasty remaining as monarchs.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Lane Poole, 60-1; Zambaur, 81 and Table C.
EI[1] 'Morocco. II History' (G. Yver), 'Saʿdians' (A. Cour), 'Shorfā'' (E. Lévi-Provençal).
H. Terrasse, *Histoire du Maroc*, II.

H. de Castries, ed., *Les sources inédites de l'histoire du Maroc de 1530 à 1845*, Series 1, *Dynastie Saadienne 1530-1660*, Vol. 1, Part 1 (Paris 1905), with detailed genealogical table of the Sa'dīs between pp. 382-3.

⟨16⟩
The Sanūsiyya
1253- /1837-
Libya

1253/1837	Sayyid Muḥammad b. 'Alī, as-Sanūsī al-Kabīr, founder of the Sanūsī order
1276/1859	Sayyid al-Mahdī
1320/1902	Sayyid Aḥmad ash-Sharīf (1336/1918 gave up military and political leadership, but retained spiritual primacy till his death in 1351/1933)
1336- /1918-	Sayyid Muḥammad Idrīs (initially as military and political leader; 1371/1951 became King Idrīs of Libya)

Muḥammad b. 'Alī, known as the 'Great Sanūsī', was born in Algeria towards the end of the eighteenth century. Whilst studying in Fez, he was much influenced by the dervishes or Ṣūfīs of Morocco, especially by those of the Tijāniyya order, and later, whilst further studying in the Ḥijāz, he joined several dervish orders himself. In addition to this inclination towards mysticism, he developed reformist and innovatory ideas, and in Mecca, organised his own *ṭarīqa* or order, the Sanūsiyya (1253/1837). Finding his homeland Algeria in process of being taken over by the French, he settled in Cyrenaica. Several *zāwiyas*, religious and educational centres for the Sanūsīs, were now founded there, including in 1272/1856 that of Jaghbūb near the Egyptian border; this was to be the headquarters of the order until 1313/1895, when it was moved southwards to the less accessible oasis of Kufra. The Sanūsī message appealed to the desert-dwellers of North Africa and the Sudan. Veneration for the person of the Grand Sanūsī accorded with the mara-

boutism and saint-worship of those regions, but the firm organisation of the order gave these enthusiasms lasting effect and purpose. Expectations of a coming Mahdī, who would restore the supremacy of pristine Islam, were also rife, as events in Dongola were to show in the Mahdiyya movement there of the eighteen-eighties and nineties. The Sanūsīs hoped for a reunion and regeneration of all Islamic peoples, and the Ottoman sultan 'Abd-al-Ḥamīd II hoped to recruit their support as part of a Pan-Islamic crusade. The Sanūsīs were, indeed, enthusiastic propagators of their ideas, and *zāwiyas* were founded in the Ḥijāz, Egypt, the Fezzān, and as far south as Wadai and Lake Chad, the faith following in this case the trans-Saharan caravan routes.

The Sanūsīs were in the forefront of Muslim opposition to the French advance into the central Sudan, and for some thirty years were to provide the spiritual and military driving-power for resistance to the invading Italians in Libya, especially in Cyrenaica. Italy's entry into the First World War in 1915 on the Allied side inevitably inclined the Sanūsīs towards the Turkish cause, and the head of the order, Sayyid Aḥmad, held on in Cyrenaica till 1918, departing then for Istanbul; the military direction of the Muslim cause in Cyrenaica was thereafter left largely to local Sanūsī leaders. During the Second World War, the British government recognised Muḥammad Idrīs, who had been an exile in Egypt for twenty years, not merely as a spiritual chief but also as Amīr or political and military leader of the Sanūsīs of Cyrenaica. In 1371/1951 he became king of the federated kingdom of Libya, comprising Cyrenaica, Tripolitania and the Fezzān; in 1382/1963 it became a unitary state. Thus the process of the Sanūsī family's development from being heads of a religious movement to the headship of a modern Arab state is somewhat reminiscent of the Wahhābiyya and the Āl Sa'ūd in Sa'ūdī Arabia.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Zambaur, 89; EI[1] 'al-Sanūsī'.

E. Graefe, 'Der Aufruf des Scheichs der Senūsīja zum Heiligen Kriege', *Der Islam*, III (1912), 141-50, 312-13.

E. E. Evans-Pritchard, *The Sanusi of Cyrenaica* (Oxford 1949).

N. A. Ziadeh, *Sanūsīyah, a study of a revivalist movement in Islam* (Leiden 1958).

THREE

THE FERTILE CRESCENT: EGYPT SYRIA AND IRAQ

⟨17⟩ The Ṭūlūnids 254-92/868-905 *Egypt and Syria*

254/868 Aḥmad b. Ṭūlūn
270/884 Khumārawayh
282/896 Jaysh
283/896 Hārūn
292/905 Shaybān
Conquest by the caliphal general Muhammad b. Sulaymān

The Ṭūlūnids represent the first local dynasty of Egypt and Syria to secure autonomy from Baghdad. Aḥmad b. Ṭūlūn (Ṭūlūn < Turkish *dolun* 'full [moon]') was a Turkish soldier, whose father had been sent in the tribute from Bukhara in the early ninth century. Aḥmad first came to Egypt as deputy of the 'Abbāsid governor there, but then acquired the governorship himself, extending his power into Palestine and Syria also. His ambitions were facilitated by the preoccupation of al-Muwaffaq–the caliph al-Mu'tamid's brother and virtual ruler in the caliphate–with the Zanj rebels in Lower Iraq, which meant that Aḥmad could not be dislodged from the west. Under Aḥmad's son Khumārawayh, the Ṭūlūnids' fortunes continued to be high. The new caliph, al-Mu'taḍid, had on his accession in 279/892 to grant to Khumārawayh and his heirs for thirty years Egypt, Syria to the Taurus Mts. and al-Jazīra (i.e. northern Mesopotamia) with the exception of Mosul in

return for a tribute of 300,000 dinars. The treaty was later revised in a form less favourable to the Ṭūlūnids, but it was not until Khumārawayh's death in 282/896 that the fabric of their empire, weakened by Khumārawayh's reckless extravagances, began to crack. The inability of the last Ṭūlūnids to keep the Qarmaṭī religious sectaries of the Syrian desert in check led the caliph to despatch an army which conquered Syria and then seized the Ṭūlūnid capital of Fusṭāṭ or Old Cairo, carrying off the remaining members of the family to Baghdad.

For the Egyptian historians, the age of the Ṭūlūnids was a golden one. Aḥmad held power by means of a large slave army, in which Turks, Greeks and black Nubians predominated, but the ensuing financial burden was alleviated for the people of Egypt by the ending of governmental malpractices; only under Khumārawayh did administrative chaos and insubordination in the army appear. Since Syria can best be held from Egypt by sea, Aḥmad also built a strong fleet. He was a great builder in his capital Fusṭāṭ, laying out there the military quarter of al-Qaṭā'i' and constructing his famous mosque to accommodate all those troops who could not find room in the mosque of 'Amr b. al-'Āṣ.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Lane Poole, 68; Zambaur, 93.
EI[1] 'Ṭūlūnids' (H. A. R. Gibb).
Z. M. Hassan, *Les Tulunides: étude de l'Égypte musulmane à la fin du IX[e] siècle* (Paris 1933).
O. Grabar, *The coinage of the Ṭūlūnids* (American Numismatic Society, Numismatic Notes and Monographs, No. 139, New York 1957).

⟨18⟩
The Ikhshīdids
323-58/935-69
Egypt and Syria

323/935 Muḥammad b. Ṭughj al-Ikhshīd
334/946 Ūnūjūr [? On Uyghur]
349/961 'Alī
355/966 Kāfūr, originally regent for 'Alī
357-8/968-9 Aḥmad
Conquest of Egypt by the Fāṭimid general Jawhar

Muḥammad b. Ṭughj came of a Turkish military family which had already been in the 'Abbasids' service for two generations. He was appointed governor of Egypt in 323/935, and secured from the caliph ar-Rāḍī the title of *Ikhshīd*. The Arab sources are unclear about the meaning of this title, but it is obvious that Muḥammad b. Ṭughj knew that it was a designation of honour in the Central Asian homeland of his forebears (it is in fact an Iranian title meaning 'prince, ruler', and had been borne by the local Iranian rulers of Soghdia and Farghāna). Muḥammad b. Ṭughj defended himself against the caliph's *Amīr al-Umarā'* or Commander-in-Chief, Muḥammad b. Rā'iq, and against the Ḥamdānids in Syria, holding on to Damascus. His two sons were, however, mere puppets, and real power passed to his Nubian slave Kāfūr (*Kāfūr* ='camphor', a reference by antiphrasis to his black colour), whom he appointed regent for his sons just before he died. On 'Alī's death in 355/966, Kāfūr became unrestricted ruler. To Kāfūr belongs the credit of holding up the threatened Fāṭimid advance along the North African coast and of containing the Ḥamdānids in northern Syria; it was only after his death in 357/968 that a weak and ephemeral grandson of Muḥammad b. Ṭughj was installed in Fusṭāṭ, to go down almost immediately before the Fāṭimid invasion. Kāfūr was famed as a liberal patron of literature and the arts, and it was at his court that the poet al-Mutanabbī spent some time.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Lane Poole, 69; Zambaur, 93.
EI[1] 'Ikhshīdids' (C. H. Becker).

⟨19⟩

The Fāṭimids

297-567/909-1171

North Africa, and then Egypt and Syria

The Dāʿī *Abū-ʿAbdallāh ash-Shīʿī, completed his preparatory work in 298/910*

297/909 ʿUbaydallāh al-Mahdī
322/934 al-Qāʾim
334/946 al-Manṣūr
341/953 al-Muʿizz
365/975 al-ʿAzīz
386/996 al-Ḥākim
411/1021 aẓ-Ẓāhir
427/1036 al-Mustanṣir
487/1094 al-Mustaʿlī
495/1101 al-Āmir
524/1130 interregnum; rule by al-Ḥāfiẓ as Regent but not yet as Caliph
525/1131 al-Ḥāfiẓ
544/1149 aẓ-Ẓāfir
549/1154 al-Fāʾiz
555-67/1160-71 al-ʿĀḍid
Ayyūbid conquest

The Fāṭimids claimed Alid descent and derived their name from Fāṭima, daughter of the Prophet and wife of the fourth caliph ʿAlī; but Sunnī opponents usually referred to them as the ʿUbaydiyyūn, descendants of ʿUbaydallāh al-Mahdī, explicitly denying any Alid connection. Some enemies amongst their contemporaries even accused the Fāṭimids of being Jewish in origin (to be accused of Jewish antecedents was, however, a common form of calumny in mediaeval Islam). Their connection with the seventh Imām Ismāʿīl has never been fully elucidated, but it is clear that the Fāṭimid caliphate represents the most successful and enduring political achievement of the Ismāʿīlī radical Shīʿī movement.

The first Fāṭimid caliph ʿUbaydallāh came from Syria to North Africa, where the dissemination of Shīʿī propaganda had already made conditions propitious for his arrival. With the

support of the sedentary Ketāma Berbers, he overthrew the Aghlabid governors of Ifriqiyya and the Khārijī Rustamids of Tāhart, and made the Idrīsids of Fez his tributaries. Sicily was occupied, and naval operations undertaken against the Byzantines. From their Ifriqiyyan base of al-Mahdiyya, the Fāṭimids amassed supplies and treasure in preparation for an advance eastwards, and in 358/969 their general Jawhar entered Old Cairo or Fusṭāṭ, removing the last Ikhshīdid. As they had done in the case of al-Mahdiyya in Ifriqiyya, the Fāṭimids began to build for themselves a new capital in Egypt, that of New Cairo (*al-Qāhira* 'the Victorious').

From Egypt, the Fāṭimids extended into Palestine and Syria, and took over the guardianship of the Holy Places in the Ḥijāz. During the long reign of al-Mustanṣir (427-87/1036-94), they reached the zenith of their power. After initially clashing with the Greeks over Syria, the caliphs generally enjoyed peaceful relations with Byzantium; later in the eleventh century, the common threat of the Seljuqs and the Turkmen adventurers in Syria and Anatolia further drew them together. The Ismā'īlī *dā'īs* or missionaries of the Fāṭimids worked as far afield as the Yemen and Sind, and in 451/1059 Baghdad was temporarily held in al-Mustanṣir's name. The appearance of the First Crusade at the end of the century was more of a threat to the Turkish rulers of Syria than to the Fāṭimids, for by then the latter held virtually no territory north of Ascalon in Palestine. Certain Muslim historians allege that the Fāṭimids encouraged the Franks to land, but this is improbable. The Fāṭimid viziers of the middle twelfth century co-operated with the Zangid Nūr-ad-Dīn of Aleppo and Damascus against the Crusaders, but nevertheless lost Ascalon to them (548/1153). Soon afterwards, the Fāṭimid kingdom began to crumble internally; the caliphs had now lost much of their power, and the viziers had assumed much of the executive and military leadership. Accordingly, it was not difficult for Saladin to end Fāṭimid rule altogether in 567/1171 as the last caliph lay dying.

In rivalry with the 'Abbāsids, the Fāṭimids had proclaimed themselves the true caliphs, yet the majority of their subjects remained Sunnīs and kept most of their religious liberty. Many of the *dā'īs* trained at the newly-founded college of al-Az'har in Cairo went to work outside the Fāṭimid dominions. Except

during the first part of the unbalanced Caliph al-Ḥākim's reign, the Christians and Jews were comparatively well-treated, and some of them occupied high offices in the state. It was during al-Ḥākim's reign that the extremist Shī'ī religious movement of the Druzes became implanted in southern Syria and Lebanon; because of al-Ḥākim's encouragement of the founder, the *dā'ī* ad-Darazī, the Druzes came to revere that caliph as an incarnation of God. On the death of al-Mustanṣir, there was a serious split in the Ismā'īlī movement, with two parties ranged behind his two sons Nizār and al-Musta'lī. The partisans of the former, the more activist and extremist of the two groups, became the Assassins or Ismā'īlīs of Syria and Persia (see below, pp. 127-8), whilst al-Musta'lī's more moderate followers are the spiritual ancestors of the modern Bohra Ismā'īlī community of Bombay. Al-Musta'lī retained the caliphate, but the spiritual basis of the Fāṭimid movement was to some extent impaired, above all after a further religio-political crisis on the death of al-Āmir in 525/1130.

Egypt and Cairo enjoyed under the Fāṭimids an economic prosperity and cultural vitality which eclipsed those of contemporary Iraq and Baghdad. Trade links were maintained with the non-Islamic world, including India and the Christian Mediterranean countries; in this commercial activity, Jews seem to have played an important rôle. It is from the workshops of Egypt at this time, too, that some of the finest products of Islamic art were turned out.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Lane Poole, 70-3; Zambaur, 94-5.
EI² 'Fāṭimids' (M. Canard).
Ḥusayn Fayḍallāh al-Hamdānī and Ḥasan Sulaimān Maḥmūd al-Juhanī, *aṣ-Ṣulayḥiyyūn wa-l-ḥaraka al-Fāṭimiyya fi-l-Yaman (min sanat 268 ilā sanat 626 h.)* (Cairo 1955), with a very detailed table at p. 343,

⟨20⟩
The Ḥamdānids
293–394/905–1004
al-Jazīra and Syria

1. Mosul branch

293/905	Abū-l-Hayjā' 'Abdallāh (governor of Mosul for the Caliph)
317/929	Nāṣir-ad-Dawla al-Ḥasan
358/969	'Uddat-ad-Dawla Abū-Taghlib
369/979	*Būyid conquest*
379–89/981–91	Ibrāhīm, al-Ḥusayn } restored by the Būyids as joint rulers
	Conquest of Mosul by the 'Uqaylids, and of Diyārbakr by the Marwānids

2. Aleppo branch

333/945	Sayf-ad-Dawla 'Alī I
356/967	Sa'd-ad-Dawla Sharīf I
381/991	Sa'īd-ad-Dawla Sa'īd
392/1002	'Alī II
394/1004	Sharīf II
	Power seized by the slave general Lu'lu', and then conquest by the Fāṭimids

The Ḥamdānids were from the Arab tribe of Taghlib, long settled in al-Jazīra (although certain authorities allege that they were only *mawālī* or clients of Taghlib). The founder of the family's fortunes, Ḥamdān b. Ḥamdūn, appears in the later years of the ninth century as an ally of the Khārijīs of al-Jazīra, in rebellion against caliphal authority; later, the Hamdānids followed the Shī'ī faith of the majority of Arab tribes on the Syrian Desert fringes. However, Ḥamdān's son al-Ḥusayn became a commander in the service of the 'Abbāsids, and distinguished himself against the Qarāmiṭa of the Syrian Desert. Another son, Abū-l-Hayjā' 'Abdallāh, was in 293/905 appointed governor of Mosul, and 'Abdallāh's own son, al-Ḥasan, eventually succeeded there as Nāṣir-ad-Dawla, behaving as an independent ruler and extending his power westwards from the Ḥamdānids' original centre of Diyār Rabī'a into Syria. His son

Abū-Taghlib, called *al-Ghaḍanfar* 'the Lion', was unfortunate enough to confront the great Būyid Amīr 'Aḍud-ad-Dawla at the height of the latter's power, when he had just in 367/978 taken over Iraq from his cousin 'Izz-ad-Dawla. 'Aḍud-ad-Dawla marched northwards and drove out Abū-Taghlib, who fled to the Fāṭimids in a vain search for help. His two brothers were afterwards restored in Mosul by the Būyids, and reigned there for a while until another family of Arab amīrs, the 'Uqaylids (see below, pp. 55-6), took over the city.

Nevertheless, the Ḥamdānids still had their lands in Syria, ruled by Abū-Taghlib's uncle, the famous Sayf-ad-Dawla, who had captured Aleppo, Ḥimṣ (Homs) and other towns from the Ikhshīdids. The establishment of the Hamdānids in Syria coincided with a great recovery of Byzantine fortunes under the energetic Macedonian emperors, and much of Sayf-ad-Dawla's reign was occupied in defending his lands against the Greeks. His son Sa'd-ad-Dawla was unable to prevent the Byzantines from several times invading Syria and temporarily capturing Aleppo and Ḥimṣ, although these were left to the Ḥamdānids as tributaries; moreover, a fresh threat arose in southern Syria from the expansionist policies of the Fāṭimids. Finally, Sa'd-ad-Dawla's son Sa'īd-ad-Dawla was killed, probably at the instigation of the slave general Lu'lu', who at first ruled as regent for the Ḥamdānid's two sons, but later assumed power independently as a vassal of the Fāṭimids.

The Ḥamdānids achieved renown as munificent patrons of Arabic literature, above all for Sayf-ad-Dawla's encouragement of the poet al-Mutanabbī. Yet although they came to rule over a prosperous region, with many centres of urban trade and activity, the Ḥamdānids still retained something of the irresponsibility and destructiveness of Bedouins. Syria and al-Jazīra inevitably suffered from the ravages of warfare but the geographer Ibn-Ḥawqal further records that the amīrs' rapacity aggravated the distress there.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Lane Poole, 111-13; Zambaur, 133-4.
EI[2] 'Ḥamdānids' (M. Canard).
M. Canard, *Histoire de la dynastie des H'amdânides de Jazîra et de Syrie*, I (Paris 1953).

⟨21⟩

The Mazyadids

c. 350–545/c. 961–1150

Ḥilla and central Iraq

c. 350/c. 961	Sanā'-ad-Dawla 'Alī I b. Mazyad
408/1018	Nūr-ad-Dawla Dubays I
474/1081	Bahā'-ad-Dawla Manṣūr
479/1086	Sayf-ad-Dawla Ṣadaqa I
501/1108	Nūr-ad-Dawla Dubays II
529/1135	Sayf-ad-Dawla Ṣadaqa II
532/1138	Muḥammad
540–5/1145–50	'Alī II
	Conquest by Seljuq troops

The Mazyadids belonged to the Asad tribe, and were strongly Shī'ī in sympathy. The family acquired a hold on the region between Hīt and Kūfa when lands there were conveyed to them during the reign of the Būyid Amīr Mu'izz-ad-Dawla at some date between 345/956 and 352/963. The beginnings of 'Alī b. Mazyad's reign must therefore be put back, according to Makdisi, to well before the date in the early eleventh century usually given in western sources. It seems also that the Mazyadid capital Ḥilla was already in the early eleventh century a permanent settlement and not a mere encampment, and that it gradually merged with and replaced the former Jāmi'ayn; under the great Ṣadaqa I b. Manṣūr, the town was enclosed by a strong wall and became the fortified centre of Mazyadid power in Iraq.

Despite their Bedouin origins, the Mazyadids showed themselves skilful organisers and diplomatists, making themselves a significant power in the shifting patterns of alliances in the Iraq of the Seljuq period. Their early rivals were the 'Uqaylids of Mosul and al-Jazīra, who in the reign of Dubays I b. 'Alī supported Dubays's brother Muqallad in the latter's bid for the Mazyadid throne. When Toghrïl and the Seljuqs appeared in Iraq, Dubays feared the Turkish invaders and supported the pro-Fāṭimid, Shī'i general Arslan Basāsīrī in Baghdad. During the troubled reign of the Seljuq Berk-yaruq, Ṣadaqa I, the so-called 'King of the Arabs', acquired a position of great influence, but once Sultan Muḥammad b. Malik-Shāh was firmly on the

throne, he moved against his overmighty vassal, and in 501/1108 defeated and killed Ṣadaqa in battle. The later Mazyadids allied with various Turkish amīrs against Sultan Mas'ūd b. Muḥammad, and Ḥilla was occupied on various occasions by Seljuq and caliphal troops. Ṣadaqa's son Dubays II achieved great fame amongst the Crusaders, *inter alios*, and was a great patron of the Arabic poets of his time, but was murdered by one of the Assassins at the same time as the caliphal-Mustarshid was killed. After the last Mazyadid, 'Alī II b. Dubays, died in 545/1150, Ḥilla was granted out by Mas'ūd to one of his generals, and a few years later, the Mazyadids' troops and supporters in Ḥilla were finally scattered by an incoming caliphal army.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Lane Poole, 119-20; Zambaur, 137.
EI[1] 'Mazyadīs' (K. V. Zetterstéen).
G. Makdisi, 'Notes on Ḥilla and the Mazyadids in mediaeval Islam', JAOS, LXXIV (1954), 249-62.

⟨22⟩

The Marwānids

372-478/983-1085

Diyārbakr

?	Bādh
380/990	al-Ḥasan b. Marwān
387/997	Mumahhid-ad-Dawla Sa'īd
401/1011	Naṣr-ad-Dawla Aḥmad or Muḥammad b. Marwān
453/1061	Niẓām-ad-Dawla Naṣr (in Mayyāfāriqīn, and after 455/1063 in Āmid also)
453/1061	Sa'īd (in Āmid till 455/1063)
472-8/1079-85	Manṣūr
	Seljuq conquest

The Marwānids of Diyārbakr, Khilāṭ and Malāzgird were Kurdish in origin. The founder Bādh was a Kurdish chief who seized various strongholds on the frontiers of Armenia and Kurdistan; taking advantage of the decline in the Būyids' influence there after the death in 372/983 of 'Aḍud-ad-Dawla, he took over Diyārbakr, held Mosul for a time and even threatened Baghdad in 373/983. His nephew Ibn-Marwān (Naṣr-ad-Dawla) ruled for over fifty years and raised the Marwānid principality to a high level of power and affluence. The strategic position of Diyārbakr, commanding as it did the routes from Iraq and the east to Syria and Anatolia, meant that Ibn-Marwān needed a skilful diplomatic policy to survive between powerful neighbours, all struggling for influence in the area. He recognised the 'Abbāsid caliph at the outset, but he also had the Fāṭimids as neighbours in northern Syria, and Fāṭimid cultural influence was strong in Diyārbakr. For a time, he had to pay tribute to the 'Uqaylids of Mosul and cede to them Niṣībīn in 421/1030. He had amicable relations with the Byzantines, and the Emperor Constantine x used Ibn-Marwān's good offices to get the captured Georgian prince Liparit freed by the Seljuq sultan Toghril. The Oghuz nomads and their flocks were ejected from Diyārbakr in 433/1041-2, and Toghril himself did not appear there till 448/1056, when Ibn-Marwān recognised him as suzerain. Internally, the towns of Āmid, Mayyāfāriqīn,

and Ḥiṣn Kayfā enjoyed much material prosperity and there was a vigorous cultural life; the local historian of Mayyāfāriqīn, Ibn-al-Azraq, describes how Ibn-Marwān lightened taxes and did many public and charitable works there.

On his death in 453/1061, his territories were divided between his sons Naṣr and Sa'īd, but the power of the Marwānids was now waning. The cupidity of the caliphal vizier, Fakhr-ad-Dawla b. Jahīr (who had previously been in Ibn-Marwān's service), was now aroused, although the Marwānids had done the Seljuqs no harm. Fakhr-ad-Dawla and his son 'Amīd-ad-Dawla secured permission from Sultan Malik-Shāh to invade the Marwānid territories with a Seljuq army, and in 478/1085, after stiff fighting, they conquered them and incorporated them into the Seljuq empire. The last Marwānid, Manṣūr, lived on in Jazīrat ibn-'Umar till 489/1096, but over the next centuries, Diyārbakr was to be predominantly under the control of Turkmen dynasties.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Lane Poole, 118; Zambaur, 136.
EI[1] 'Marwānids' (K. V. Zetterstéen), 'Naṣr al-Dawla' (H. Bowen).
H. F. Amedroz, 'The Marwānid dynasty at Mayyāfāriqīn in the tenth and eleventh centuries A.D.', JRAS (1903), 123-54.

⟨23⟩ The ʿUqaylids
c. 380-489/c. 990-1096
Al-Jazīra, Iraq and northern Syria

1. Line in Jazīrat ibn-ʿUmar, Niṣībīn and Balad

c. 380/c. 390	Muḥammad
386/996	Janāḥ-ad-Dawla ʿAlī
390/1000	Sinān-ad-Dawla al-Ḥasan
393/1003	Nūr-ad-Dawla Muṣʿab

2. Line in Mosul and later in Jazīrat ibn-ʿUmar, Niṣībīn and Balad

c. 382/c. 992	Muḥammad
386/996	Ḥusām-ad-Dawla al-Muqallad
391/1001	Muʿtamid-ad-Dawla Qirwāsh
442/1050	Zaʿīm-ad-Dawla Baraka
443/1052	ʿAlam-ad-Dīn Quraysh
453/1061	Sharaf-ad-Dawla Muslim
478/1085	Ibrāhīm
486-9/1093-6	ʿAlī
	Conquest by the Seljuq Tutush

3. Line of Maʿn b. al-Muqallad in Takrīt

?	Rāfiʿ
427/1036	Khamīs
435/1044	Abū-Ghashshām
444/1052	ʿĪsā
448/1056	Naṣr
449-?/1057-?	*Abū-l-Ghanāʾim, governor on behalf of ʿĪsā's widow*

4. Other minor branches at ʿĀna and al-Ḥadītha, Qalʿat Jaʿbar, ʿUkbarā and Hīt; for details, see Lane Poole and Zambaur, loc. cit.

The ʿUqaylids came from the great Bedouin tribal group of ʿĀmir b. Ṣaʿṣaʿa, which also included the Khafāja and Muntafiq of lower Iraq. With the decay of the last Ḥamdānids in Mosul,

and Ḥiṣn Kayfā enjoyed much material prosperity and there was a vigorous cultural life; the local historian of Mayyāfāriqīn, Ibn-al-Azraq, describes how Ibn-Marwān lightened taxes and did many public and charitable works there.

On his death in 453/1061, his territories were divided between his sons Naṣr and Sa'īd, but the power of the Marwānids was now waning. The cupidity of the caliphal vizier, Fakhr-ad-Dawla b. Jahīr (who had previously been in Ibn-Marwān's service), was now aroused, although the Marwānids had done the Seljuqs no harm. Fakhr-ad-Dawla and his son 'Amīd-ad-Dawla secured permission from Sultan Malik-Shāh to invade the Marwānid territories with a Seljuq army, and in 478/1085, after stiff fighting, they conquered them and incorporated them into the Seljuq empire. The last Marwānid, Manṣūr, lived on in Jazīrat ibn-'Umar till 489/1096, but over the next centuries, Diyārbakr was to be predominantly under the control of Turkmen dynasties.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Lane Poole, 118; Zambaur, 136.
EI[1] 'Marwānids' (K. V. Zetterstéen), 'Naṣr al-Dawla' (H. Bowen).
H. F. Amedroz, 'The Marwānid dynasty at Mayyāfāriqīn in the tenth and eleventh centuries A.D.', JRAS (1903), 123-54.

⟨23⟩

The 'Uqaylids

c. 380-489/c. 990-1096

Al-Jazīra, Iraq and northern Syria

1. Line in Jazīrat ibn-'Umar, Niṣībīn and Balad

c. 380/c. 390	Muḥammad
386/996	Janāḥ-ad-Dawla 'Alī
390/1000	Sinān-ad-Dawla al-Ḥasan
393/1003	Nūr-ad-Dawla Muṣ'ab

2. Line in Mosul and later in Jazīrat ibn-'Umar, Niṣībīn and Balad

c. 382/c. 992	Muḥammad
386/996	Ḥusām-ad-Dawla al-Muqallad
391/1001	Mu'tamid-ad-Dawla Qirwāsh
442/1050	Za'īm-ad-Dawla Baraka
443/1052	'Alam-ad-Dīn Quraysh
453/1061	Sharaf-ad-Dawla Muslim
478/1085	Ibrāhīm
486-9/1093-6	'Alī
	Conquest by the Seljuq Tutush

3. Line of Ma'n b. al-Muqallad in Takrīt

?	Rāfi'
427/1036	Khamīs
435/1044	Abū-Ghashshām
444/1052	'Īsā
448/1056	Naṣr
449-?/1057-?	*Abū-l-Ghanā'im, governor on behalf of 'Īsā's widow*

4. Other minor branches at 'Āna and al-Ḥadītha, Qal'at Ja'bar, 'Ukbarā and Hīt, for details, see Lane Poole and Zambaur, loc. cit.

The 'Uqaylids came from the great Bedouin tribal group of 'Āmir b. Ṣa'ṣa'a, which also included the Khafāja and Muntafiq of lower Iraq. With the decay of the last Ḥamdānids in Mosul,

the city passed to the 'Uqaylid Muḥammad, who held it under the nominal suzerainty of the Būyid Bahā'-ad-Dawla. After Muḥammad's death, there were internecine struggles for power amongst his sons, but control over Mosul and the other 'Uqaylid towns and fortresses in al-Jazīra eventually came to Qirwāsh b. al-Muqallad. Qirwāsh's main problem was to preserve intact his dominions in face of the Oghuz invaders of western Persia and Iraq during the third and fourth decades of the eleventh century, and this defence necessitated alliances with another threatened power in Iraq, the Mazyadids of Ḥilla.

Under Muslim b. Quraysh, the 'Uqaylid dominions stretched almost from Baghdad as far as Aleppo. Being Shī'ī, Muslim's natural inclination was to support the Fāṭimids against the Seljuqs, but he allied with Sultans Alp-Arslan and Malik-Shāh in order to secure the Mirdāsid territories in northern Syria. But a further switch back to the Fāṭimids brought Seljuq armies to Mosul, forcing Muslim to flee to Āmid and Aleppo, where he was eventually killed fighting the Seljuq rebel Sulaymān b. Qutalmīsh (478/1085). 'Uqaylids survived in Mosul as governors on behalf of the Seljuqs until Tutush extinguished them; but other 'Uqaylids persisted in al-Jazīra as local lords, the branch in Raqqa and Qal'at Ja'bar lasting down to 564/1169 when Nūr-ad-Dīn Zangī took over from them.

It seems that the 'Uqaylids were not entirely a predatory Bedouin dynasty, but had introduced some features at least of the standard pattern of 'Abbāsid administration into their territories; it is mentioned that Muslim b. Quraysh had a postmaster or local intelligence officer (*Ṣāḥib al-khabar*) in every village. The passing of the 'Uqaylids and of the Mazyadids soon afterwards marks the end of the period during which Arab amīrates held power over large stretches of Iraq and Syria, maintaining themselves between the great powers of the Fāṭimids, Būyids and Seljuqs. The Shī'ī sympathies of these amīrates, and their strategic positions commanding the routes westwards into Diyārbakr and Anatolia, inevitably brought them up against the expansionist, Sunnī Seljuqs. Henceforth, political and military leadership in Iraq, al-Jazīra and Syria was to be almost exclusively in Turkish hands.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Lane Poole, 116-17; Zambaur, 135.

⟨24⟩
The Mirdāsids
414-72/1023-79
Aleppo and northern Syria

414/1023	Asad-ad-Dawla Ṣāliḥ b. Mirdās
420/1029	Shibl-ad-Dawla Naṣr I
429/1038	*Fāṭimid conquest*
433/1041	Mu'izz-ad-Dawla Thimāl, *first reign*
449/1057	*Fāṭimid occupation*
452/1060	Rashīd-ad-Dawla Maḥmūd, *first reign*
453/1061	Thimāl, *second reign*
454/1062	'Aṭiyya (in Raqqa till 463/1071)
457/1065	Maḥmūd, *second reign*
466/1074	Jalāl-ad-Dawla Naṣr II
468-72/1076-9	Sābiq
	'Uqaylid occupation

The Mirdāsids were part of the North Arab tribe of Kilāb, who in the early eleventh century migrated northwards from the Ḥilla region of Iraq to Aleppo, which their leader Ṣāliḥ b. Mirdās captured in 414/1023. The Mirdāsid migration thus forms part of the general movement of Bedouins – most of whom were Shī'ī in faith – into the settled fringes of Iraq and Syria during the tenth and early eleventh centuries; it is possible that the unsettled conditions in the Syrian Desert brought about by the Qarmaṭī or Carmathian risings there provided one of the stimuli to this movement.

Once established in Aleppo, Ṣāliḥ and his sons Naṣr and Thimāl had to defend themselves on one side against the Fāṭimids, overlords of northern Syria, and on the other against the resurgent Byzantines under Basil II Bulgaroctonus and Romanus III Argyrus. For four years, Aleppo was occupied by the Fāṭimid governor of Damascus, Anūshtigīn (429-33/1038-41); and Thimāl was a second time obliged to abandon Aleppo in 449/1057, exchanging it for Acre, Beirut, and Jubayl, on account of pressure from undisciplined Kilābī tribesmen on his position in Aleppo. The westwards advance of the Seljuqs, the appearance in northern Syria of Turkmen nomads and soldiers of fortune, and the waning of Fāṭimid influence there,

confronted the Mirdāsids with a new situation. Maḥmūd b. Naṣr found it expedient to transfer his allegiance from the Fāṭimids to the Sunnī 'Abbāsids and to submit to the Seljuq sultan Alp-Arslan. Latterly, Mirdāsid authority in Aleppo was undermined by the disputes between their Turkish mercenaries and the Kilābī tribesmen, and in 468/1076 a civil war broke out between the two Mirdāsid brothers Sābiq and Waththāb. Pressure on Aleppo from Tutush, who was carving out for himself a Seljuq principality in Syria, drove Sābiq in 472/1079 to hand over the city to the 'Uqaylid Muslim b. Quraysh, the surviving members of the Mirdāsid family being compensated by the grant of various towns in Syria.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Lane Poole, 114-15; Zambaur, 133, 135.
EI[1] 'Ṣāliḥ b. Mirdās', 'Ḥalab' (M. Sobernheim).

⟨25⟩

The Ayyūbids

564-end of the 9th century/1169-end of the 15th century

Egypt, Syria, Diyārbakr, the Yemen

1. In Egypt

564/1169 al-Malik an-Nāṣir I Ṣalāḥ-ad-Dīn (Saladin)
589/1193 al-Malik al-ʿAzīz ʿImād-ad-Dīn
595/1198 al-Malik al-Manṣūr Nāṣir-ad-Dīn
596/1200 al-Malik al-ʿĀdil I Sayf-ad-Dīn
615/1218 al-Malik al-Kāmil I Nāṣir-ad-Dīn
635/1238 al-Malik al-ʿĀdil II Sayf-ad-Dīn
637/1240 al-Malik aṣ-Ṣāliḥ Najm-ad-Dīn Ayyūb
647/1249 al-Malik al-Muʿaẓẓam Tūrān-Shāh
648-50/1250-2 al-Malik al-Ashraf II Muẓaffar-ad-Dīn
Baḥrī Mamlūks

2. In Damascus

582/1186 al-Malik al-Afḍal Nūr-ad-Dīn ʿAlī
592/1196 al-Malik al-ʿĀdil I Sayf-ad-Dīn
615/1218 al-Malik al-Muʿaẓẓam Sharaf-ad-Dīn
624/1227 al-Malik an-Nāṣir Ṣalāḥ-ad-Dīn Dāʾūd
626/1229 al-Malik al-Ashraf I Muẓaffar-ad-Dīn
634/1237 al-Malik aṣ-Ṣāliḥ ʿImād-ad-Dīn, *first reign*
635/1238 al-Malik al-Kāmil I Nāṣir-ad-Dīn
635/1238 al-Malik al-ʿĀdil II Sayf-ad-Dīn
636/1239 al-Malik aṣ-Ṣāliḥ Najm-ad-Dīn Ayyūb, *first reign*
637/1239 al-Malik aṣ-Ṣāliḥ ʿImād-ad-Dīn, *second reign*
643/1245 al-Malik aṣ-Ṣāliḥ Najm-ad-Dīn Ayyūb, *second reign*
647/1249 al-Malik al-Muʿaẓẓam Tūrān-Shāh (with Egypt)
648-58/1250-60 al-Malik an-Nāṣir II Ṣalāḥ-ad-Dīn
Mongol conquest

3. In Aleppo

579/1183 al-Malik al-ʿĀdil I Sayf-ad-Dīn

582/1186	al-Malik aẓ-Ẓāhir Ghiyāth-ad-Dīn
613/1216	al-Malik al-ʿAzīz Ghiyāth-ad-Dīn
634-58/1237-60	al-Malik an-Nāṣir II Ṣalāḥ-ad-Dīn
	Mongol conquest

4. Diyārbakr (Mayyāfāriqīn and Jabal Sinjār)

581/1185	al-Malik an-Nāṣir I Ṣalāḥ-ad-Dīn (Saladin)
591/1195	al-Malik al-ʿĀdil I Sayf-ad-Dīn
596/1200	al-Malik al-Awḥad Najm-ad-Dīn Ayyūb
607/1210	al-Malik al-Ashraf I Muẓaffar-ad-Dīn
617/1220	al-Malik al-Muẓaffar Shihāb-ad-Dīn
642-58/1244-60	al-Malik al-Kāmil II Nāṣir-ad-Dīn
	Mongol conquest

5. Diyārbakr (Ḥiṣn Kaifā and Āmid)

629/1232	al-Malik aṣ-Ṣāliḥ Najm-ad-Dīn Ayyūb
636/1239	al-Malik al-Muʿaẓẓam Tūrān-Shāh
647/1249	al-Malik al-Muwaḥḥid Taqī-ad-Dīn
682/1283	al-Malik al-Kāmil III Muḥammad
?	al-Malik al-ʿAdil Mujīr-ad-Dīn
?	al-Malik al-ʿĀdil Shihāb-ad-Dīn
?	al-Malik aṣ-Ṣāliḥ Abū-Bakr
780/1378	al-Malik al-ʿĀdil Fakhr-ad-Dīn
?	al-Malik al-Ashraf Sharaf-ad-Dīn
836/1433	al-Malik aṣ-Ṣāliḥ Ṣalāḥ-ad-Dīn
856/1452	al-Malik al-Kāmil IV Aḥmad
	al-Malik al-ʿĀdil Khalaf
866/1462	Khalīl (?)
?	Sulaymān
?	al-Ḥusayn
	Aq Qoyunlu conquest

6. The Yemen

569/1174	al-Malik al-Muʿaẓẓam Shams-ad-Dīn Tūrān-Shāh
577/1181	al-Malik al-ʿAzīz Ẓahīr-ad-Dīn Tughtigin
593/1197	Muʿizz-ad-Dīn Ismāʿīl
598/1202	al-Malik an Nāṣir Ayyūb
611/1214	al-Malik al-Muẓaffar Sulaymān

612-26/1215-29 al-Malik al-Mas'ūd Ṣalāḥ-ad-Dīn
Power taken over by the Rasūlids

7. Minor branches of the family in Ba'lbakk, Ḥimṣ, Karak, Hamā, Baniyās and Subayba, and Buṣra: see Zambaur, 98-9 for details

Ayyūb, the progenitor of the dynasty, was from the Hadhbānī tribe of Kurds, although the family seems to have been considerably Turkicised from their service at the side of Turkish soldiers. The Turkish commander of Mosul and Aleppo, Zangī b. Aq Sonqur, recruited large numbers of the bellicose Kurds into his service, including in 532/1138 Ayyūb, and soon afterwards, his brother Shīrkūh entered the service of Zangī's son Nūr-ad-Dīn. In 564/1169 Shīrkūh gained control of Egypt, but died almost immediately, and his nephew Ṣalāḥ-ad-Dīn (Saladin) was recognised by the troops as his successor.

The celebrated Saladin was accordingly the real founder of the dynasty. He extinguished the last vestiges of Fāṭimid rule in Egypt and promoted in their former territories a strongly Sunnī religious and educational policy. The Ayyūbid victory in the old Fāṭimid lands thus completes the trend of orthodox Sunnī reaction which had already under the Seljuqs brought about the overthrow of political Shī'ism in the former Būyid territories further east. Another aspect of Saladin's policy was the vigorous prosecution of *jihād* against the Crusaders, a policy which unified Islamic enthusiasm behind him and enabled him to weld together armies of Turks, Kurds, and Arabs in the common cause. With the victory of Ḥaṭṭīn in 583/1187, the holy city of Jerusalem again became Muslim after eighty years, and the Franks were driven, albeit only temporarily, from almost all their possessions except for a few coastal towns.

Before his death in 589/1193, Saladin granted out various parts of the Ayyūbid empire, including the cities of Syria, al-Jazīra, and the Yemen, as appanages for various members of his family. Nevertheless, some sense of family solidarity and central control was maintained under al-'Ādil and al-Kāmil until the latter's death. Under these two sultans, Saladin's activist policy gave place to one of détente and peaceful relations with the Franks, especially as the northern Ayyūbids in Diyārbakr

and al-Jazīra were feeling pressure from the Rūm Seljuqs and the Khwārazm-Shāhs. The culmination of this new policy was al-Kāmil's return of Jerusalem to the Emperor Frederick II, and the period of peace brought extensive economic benefits to Egypt and Syria, including a revival of trade with the Christian powers of the Mediterranean.

After al-Kāmil's death in 635/1238, the Ayyūbid dynasty was rent by internal quarrels. The Sixth Crusade was mastered and its leader, the French King St Louis, captured, but soon after aṣ-Ṣāliḥ's death, the Turkish Baḥrī slave troops seized power in Egypt, making their leader Aybak first Atabeg and then Sultan in 648/1250. Al-'Ādil had in 612/1215 sent out his young grandson al-Mas'ūd Ṣalāḥ-ad-Dīn with an Atabeg to rule the Yemen, but the Ayyūbids were unable to maintain themselves there and the land passed to their former servants the Turkish Rasūlids.

Most of the northern Ayyūbids were swept away by the Mongols, and only the branch at Hamā survived, because of its obscurity and docility, down to 742/1342. However, in Diyār-bakr, a local Kurdish principality around Ḥiṣn Kayfā survived the Tīmūrids, and this line of Ayyūbids was only ended by the Aq Qoyunlu.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Lane Poole, 74-9; Justi, 463.
Sachau, 19 (branches in Ba'lbakk, Karak and Ḥiṣn Kayfā).
Zambaur, 97-101 and Table H; EI² 'Ayyūbids' (Cl. Cahen).
H.A.R. Gibb, 'The Aiyūbids', in K.M. Setton *et al.*, eds., *A history of the Crusades.* II *The later Crusades 1189-1311* (Philadelphia 1962), 693-714.
al-Hamdānī and al-Juhanī, *aṣ-Ṣulayhiyyūn wa-l-haraka al-Fātimiyya fī-l-Yaman*, with a table of the Yemen Ayyūbids at p. 347.

⟨26⟩ The Mamlūks 648-922/1250-1517 *Egypt and Syria*

1. Baḥrī line 648-792/1250-1390

648/1250 Shajar ad-Durr
648/1250 al-Mu'izz 'Izz-ad-Dīn Aybak
655/1257 al-Manṣūr Nūr-ad-Dīn 'Alī
657/1259 al-Muẓaffar Sayf-ad-Dīn Quṭuz
658/1260 aẓ-Ẓāhir Rukn-ad-Dīn Baybars I al-Bunduqdārī
676/1277 as-Sa'īd Nāṣir-ad-Dīn Baraka [or Berke] Khan
678/1280 al-'Ādil Badr-ad-Dīn Salāmish
678/1280 al-Manṣūr Sayf-ad-Dīn Qalā'ūn al-Alfī
689/1290 al-Ashraf Ṣalāḥ-ad-Dīn Khalīl
693/1294 an-Nāṣir Nāṣir-ad-Dīn Muḥammad, *first reign*
694/1295 al-'Ādil Zayn-ad-Dīn Kitbughā
696/1297 al-Manṣūr Ḥusām-ad-Dīn Lājīn
698/1299 an-Nāṣir Nāṣir-ad-Dīn Muḥammad, *second reign*
708/1309 al-Muẓaffar Rukn-ad-Dīn Baybars II al-Jāshankīr
709/1309 an-Nāṣir Nāṣir-ad-Dīn Muḥammad, *third reign*
741/1340 al-Manṣūr Sayf-ad-Dīn Abū-Bakr
742/1341 al-Ashraf 'Alā'-ad-Dīn Kūjūk
743/1342 an-Nāṣir Shihāb-ad-Dīn Aḥmad
743/1342 aṣ-Ṣāliḥ 'Imād-ad-Dīn Ismā'īl
746/1345 al-Kāmil Sayf-ad-Dīn Sha'bān I
747/1346 al-Muẓaffar Sayf-ad-Dīn Ḥājjī I
748/1347 an-Nāṣir Nāṣir-ad-Dīn al-Ḥasan, *first reign*
752/1351 aṣ-Ṣāliḥ Ṣalāḥ-ad-Dīn Ṣāliḥ
755/1354 an-Nāṣir Nāṣir-ad-Dīn al-Ḥasan, *second reign*
762/1361 al-Manṣūr Ṣalāḥ-ad-Dīn Muḥammad
764/1363 al-Ashraf Nāṣir-ad-Dīn Sha'bān II

778/1376 al-Manṣūr ʿAlāʾ-ad-Dīn ʿAlī
783/1382 aṣ-Ṣāliḥ Ṣalāḥ-ad-Dīn Ḥājjī II, *first reign*
784/1382 aẓ-Ẓāhir Sayf ad-Dīn Barqūq [Burjī]
791/1389 Ḥājjī II (second reign, with honorific title al-Muẓaffar)

2. Burjī line 784-922/1382-1517

784/1382 aẓ-Ẓāhir Sayf-ad-Dīn Barqūq, *first reign*
791/1389 Ḥājjī II (second reign, Baḥrī)
792/1390 aẓ-Ẓāhir Sayf-ad-Dīn Barqūq, *second reign*
801/1399 an-Nāṣir Nāṣir-ad-Dīn Faraj, *first reign*
808/1405 al-Manṣūr ʿIzz-ad-Dīn ʿAbd-al-ʿAzīz
808/1405 an-Nāṣir Nāṣir-ad-Dīn Faraj, *second reign*
815/1412 al-ʿĀdil al-Mustaʿīn (ʿAbbāsid caliph, proclaimed sultan)
815/1412 al-Muʾayyad Sayf-ad-Dīn Shaykh
824/1421 al-Muẓaffar Aḥmad
824/1421 aẓ-Ẓāhir Sayf-ad-Dīn Ṭaṭār
824/1421 aṣ-Ṣāliḥ Nāṣir-ad-Dīn Muḥammad
825/1422 al-Ashraf Sayf-ad-Dīn Barsbay
841/1437 al-ʿAzīz Jamāl-ad-Dīn Yūsuf
842/1438 aẓ-Ẓāhir Sayf-ad-Dīn Jaqmaq
857/1453 al-Manṣūr Fakhr-ad-Dīn ʿUthmān
857/1453 al-Ashraf Sayf-ad-Dīn Ināl
865/1461 al-Muʾayyad Shihāb-ad-Dīn Aḥmad
865/1461 aẓ-Ẓāhir Sayf-ad-Dīn Khūshqadam
872/1467 aẓ-Ẓāhir Sayf-ad-Dīn Bilbay
872/1468 aẓ-Ẓāhir Timurbughā
872/1468 al-Ashraf Sayf-ad-Dīn Qāʾit Bay
901/1496 an-Nāṣir Muḥammad
903/1498 aẓ-Ẓāhir Qānṣūḥ
905/1500 al-Ashraf Jānbalāt
906/1501 al-ʿĀdil Sayf-ad-Dīn Tūmān Bay
906/1501 al-Ashraf Qānṣūḥ al-Ghawrī
922/1517 al-Ashraf Tūmān Bay
Ottoman conquest

The Mamlūks succeeded to the rich heritage of the Ayyūbids in Egypt and Syria. Like most major Islamic dynasties of their age, the Ayyūbids had found it necessary to support themselves with professional slave guards, and the Mamlūks (literally, 'those possessed, slaves') arose from the Turkish soldiery of al-Malik aṣ-Ṣāliḥ Najm-ad-Dīn Ayyūb. Within the two and a half centuries of independent Mamlūk rule, two lines of sultans are somewhat artificially distinguished: the Baḥrī ones, so-called because these guards originally had their barracks on the island of ar-Rawḍa in the Nile (*al-Baḥr*), and the Burjī ones, thus named because Sultan Qalā'ūn had quartered his guards in the citadel (*al-Burj*) of Cairo. Family succession generally prevailed amongst the Baḥrīs, but no hereditary succession was ever permitted amongst the Burjīs, and something like the old Turkish system of the seniorate existed. Ethnically, the Baḥrīs were mainly Qïpchaqs from South Russia, with an admixture of Mongols and Kurds; the Burjīs were primarily Circassians from the Caucasus. Down to the end of the Mamlūks in the early nineteenth century, Circassia provided most of their manpower. *Pace* the assertion of some authorities that the Mamlūks failed to perpetuate themselves more than two or three generations, it seems that Mamlūk families reproduced themselves all right, but that succeeding generations no longer followed a military career; replenishments were accordingly necessary.

The Mamlūks had a complex, hierarchical system, with the sultan's own mamlūks at the top of the structure. Slave status was essential for success in the power structure, for the free elements, including the sons of former mamlūks, had only an inferior place in the army (a similar position existed in the Ottoman Turkish slave institution, where the *Qapï Qullarï* had superior opportunities for advancement). The sultans' arbitrary power was checked by the chief amīrs and the bureaucracy, and the instability of the sultanate is seen in the rapid turnover of rulers and the three separate reigns of a sultan like an-Nāṣir Muḥammad b. Qalā'ūn. The Mamlūks continued the strongly Sunnī policy of the Ayyūbids, and their maintenance in Cairo of a line of *fainéant* 'Abbāsid caliphs (see above, pp. 8, 10) is almost certainly to be connected with this.

The strength and achievements of the Mamlūk state were impressive. Quṭuz defeated Hülegü's Mongols at 'Ayn Jālūt in

658/1260, and his successor Baybars consolidated the victory and set the régime on its feet, although the threat from the Mongols continued for several decades after this. By the end of the thirteenth century, the Crusader towns of the Syro-Palestine littoral had been mopped up, and in the next century the Rupenid kingdom of Little Armenia or Cilicia was ended. The Mamlūks thus acquired great prestige in the Islamic world as hammers of the pagan Mongols and the Christians. Their territories extended to Cyrenaica in the west, to Nubia and Massawa in the south and to the Taurus Mts in the north, and they protected the Holy Cities of Arabia. In the fifteenth century, the Ottomans were recognised as the Mamlūks' main enemies. The Turkmen principality of the Dulghadīr Oghullarī was maintained in western Diyārbakr as a buffer-state, and the Qaramānids were supported. But the superior élan and vigour of the Ottomans, and their well-developed use of artillery and firearms, worked in their favour. The last Mamlūk sultan of real significance, Qānṣūḥ al-Ghawri, was killed in battle at Marj Dābiq near Aleppo in 922/1516, and after this, Selīm the Grim occupied Syria and Egypt. These now became pashaliks of the Ottoman empire, although the military caste of the Mamlūks continued virtually to control Egypt until Muḥammad 'Alī destroyed their power in 1226/1811.

Under Mamlūk rule, Egypt and Syria enjoyed economic prosperity and a great cultural and artistic efflorescence, with especial achievements in such fields as architecture, ceramics and metalwork; the origins of the science of heraldry seem to go back to Mamlūk times. There were close commercial links with the Christian powers of the Mediterranean; thus Baybars, despite a strongly anti-Christian military policy in the Near East, made trade treaties with James I of Aragon and Charles of Anjou, King of Sicily. Only towards the end did the Portuguese circumnavigation of Africa threaten Mamlūk prosperity by diverting the transit trade through the Near East from their territories; it was these fears which lay behind Qānṣūḥ's attempt to garrison points on the coasts of Arabia, to launch fleets on the Indian Ocean and to bar the Portuguese from Indian waters.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Lane Poole, 80–3; Zambaur, 103–6.

G. Wiet, *L'Égypte arabe de la conquête arabe à la conquête ottomane, 642-1517*, in G. Hanotaux, ed., *Histoire de la nation égyptienne* (Paris 1931-40), IV.
J. Sauvaget, 'Noms et surnoms de Mamlouks', JA, CCXXXVIII (1950), 31-58.

⟨27⟩
Muḥammad 'Alī's Line
1220-1372/1805-1953
Egypt

1220/1805	Muḥammad 'Ali Pasha
1264/1848	Ibrāhīm Pasha
1264/1848	'Abbās I Pasha
1270/1854	Sa'īd Pasha
1280/1863	Ismā'īl (assumed title of Khedive in 1284/1867)
1296/1879	Tawfīq
1309/1892	'Abbās II Ḥilmī
1333/1914	Ḥusayn Kāmil (assumed title of Sultan)
1335/1917	Aḥmad Fu'ād I (assumed title of King in 1340/1922)
1355/1936	Fārūq
1371-2/1952-3	Fu'ād II
	Republican régime established

Muḥammad 'Alī (1182-1265/1769-1849) was an Albanian soldier in the Ottoman army. He first came to Egypt as part of the Turkish force sent to dislodge the occupying French, and stayed there as *de facto* ruler of the country, forcing the sultan to recognise him as governor or pasha, and getting rid of the old governing class of the Circassian Mamlūks. Muḥammad 'Alī's chief claim to fame was his realisation that his province, Egypt, could only flourish and progress if the technical discoveries, the military practices and the educational systems evolved in the West were introduced there; he therefore ranks with his contemporaries, the Ottoman sultans, Selīm III and Maḥmūd II, as a pioneer westerniser in the Middle East. A newly-raised conscript army was now used to subjugate the Sudan, a rich

source of slaves; higher educational institutions were set up, with European staff and advisers; fiscal policy was reformed and modified to meet the increased demands for revenue. Externally, Muḥammad 'Alī and his capable son Ibrāhīm intervened in the Greek War of Independence, maintained their autonomy *vis-à-vis* the sultan in Istanbul, and carried on a series of fairly inconclusive wars with the Wahhābī rulers of central Arabia.

By the end of Muḥammad 'Alī's reign, Egypt was already acquiring a weight of indebtedness, and this was accentuated by the extravagance and desire to imitate European royal standards of such rulers as Ibrāhīm's son Ismā'īl. He was the first of his line to secure from the sultan the title of khedive, a title of ancient Iranian origin, and also the promise of his descendants' hereditary succession, both indications of the virtual independence of the line. It was under Ismā'īl that work on the Suez Canal was completed, but imperialist Egyptian ventures in Ethiopia and the Sudan shattered Egypt's financial stability. Like Turkey itself, Egypt now came under the control of European creditor nations; and after the revolt of 'Urābī Pasha in 1299/1882, Britain assumed control of the Egyptian finances and stationed a permanent garrison there. Not until 1340/1922 did the British Protectorate end.

The reigns of the last two significant members of the dynasty, Fu'ād I and Fārūq, were dominated internally by struggles with the majority political party of the Wafd, and externally, by attempts to throw off the remaining vestiges of British control. Just before the end of the monarchy, Naḥḥās Pasha abrogated the Condominium Agreement over the Sudan, and proclaimed Fārūq 'King of Egypt and the Sudan'. But discontent mounted, especially after the Arab-Israeli *débâcle* of 1948. The monarchy had never been felt as truly Arab, and in 1952 Fārūq was forced to abdicate; in the following year, the monarchy was abolished.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Lane Poole, 84-5; Zambaur, 107.
EI[1] 'Khedīw' (J. H. Kramers).

FOUR

THE ARABIAN PENINSULA

⟨28⟩

The Qarāmiṭa or Carmathians

281-end of 5th century/894-end of 11th century

Eastern and central Arabia, with their centre in Baḥrayn

281/894	Abū-Saʿīd al-Ḥasan al-Jannābī
300/913	Abū-l-Qāsim Saʿīd
311/923	Abū-Ṭāhir Sulaymān
322/944	Abū-Manṣūr Aḥmad
361-6/972-7	Abū-Yaʿqūb Yūsuf
	Rule by a Council of Elders

The Qarmaṭī or Carmathian movement had its roots in the Messianic ideas of radical Shīʿism, and was probably inspired in the first place by Ismāʿīlī propaganda disseminated amongst the Bedouins of the Syrian and Arabian Deserts. In the opening years of the tenth century, Zikrawayh led a Qarmaṭī revolt in the Syrian Desert until it was suppressed in 293/906. But the greatest centre of Qarmaṭī activity was in Baḥrayn, the coastal region of eastern Arabia to the south of Iraq. Taking advantage of local social discontent and of the chaos left behind in Lower Iraq by the Zanj or black slave rebellion, the Qarāmiṭa built up a vigorous, economically prosperous and enduring state. Abū-Saʿīd, the *dāʿī* or agent of the rather shadowy figure of the Qarmaṭī founder, Ḥamdān Qarmaṭ, built up this principality, and more than a century later, the Qarāmiṭa of Baḥrain were still known by the general designation of Abū-Saʿīdīs.

The organisation of the principality was in some respects communistic, with taxes collected and shared out amongst the members of the community according to their needs, although

it rested on a foundation of black slave labour. Influenced as they were by Ismāʿīlism, with its tendencies towards interconfessionalism and contempt for the outward forms of religion, the religious practices of the Qarāmiṭa were informal, thus scandalising the orthodox. The dynasty of Abū-Saʿīd acted as leaders in war and diplomacy, and the affairs of the community were directed by a Council of Elders, the ʿ*Iqdāniyya*.

The relations of the Qarāmiṭa with the Ismāʿīlī Fāṭimids in North Africa are obscure; the present tendency is to minimise the likelihood of concerted action by the two movements in the first part of the tenth century. The Qarāmiṭa sacked Kūfa from Baḥrayn, attacked pilgrim caravans, occupied Oman and in 317/929 sacked Mecca and carried off the Black Stone from the Kaʿba, regarding it as an object of superstitious reverence; they only replaced it twenty years later at the Fāṭimid caliph al-Manṣūr's request. The Qarmaṭī state evolved into something like a republic, and flourished down to the end of the eleventh century; even two or three centuries later, Qarmaṭī doctrines were still prevalent in Baḥrayn.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Zambaur, 116.

M. J. de Goeje, *Mémoire sur les Carmathes du Bahraïn et les Fatimides* (Leiden 1886).

W. Madelung, 'Fatimiden und Baḥrainqarmaṭen', *Der Islam*, XXXIV (1959), 34–88.

⟨29⟩

The Zaydī Imāms of the Yemen or Rassids
Early 3rd century- /early 9th century-
Seat in Ṣaʻda or Ṣanʻāʼ

1. Early period (Rassid line)

?	Tarjumān-ad-Dīn al-Qāsim ar-Rassī, d. 246/860
246/860	al-Ḥusayn
280/893	Yaḥyā al-Hādī-ilā-l-Ḥaqq I
298/911	Muḥammad al-Murtaḍā
301/914	Aḥmad an-Nāṣir
?	al-Ḥusayn al-Muntakhab
324/936	al-Qāsim al-Mukhtār
?	Yūsuf al-Manṣūr ad-Dāʻī
?	al-Qāsim al-Manṣūr
393/1003	al-Ḥusayn al-Mahdī
?	Jaʻfar
426/1035	al-Ḥasan
430/1039	Abū-l-Fatʼḥ an-Nāṣir ad-Daylamī
454/1062	*capture of Ṣanʻāʼ by the Ṣulayḥids*
480/1087	*Ṣulayḥid governors*
492/1099	*rule in Ṣanʻāʼ by the Hamdānid line of Ḥātim b. al-Ghashīm*
545/1150	Aḥmad al-Mutawakkil
556/1161	*rule of the Hamdānids restored*
569/1174	*Ayyūbid conquest of the Yemen*
594/1198	ʻAbdallāh al-Manṣūr
614/1217	Yaḥyā al-Hādī-ilā-l-Ḥaqq II (in Ṣaʻda)
614/1217	Muḥammad an-Nāṣir (in the southern districts, till 623/1226)
646/1248	Aḥmad al-Mahdī al-Mūṭiʼ
656/1258	Shams-ad-Dīn Aḥmad al-Mutawakkil
c. 680/c. 1281	Dāʼūd al-Muntaṣir

2. Modern period (Qāsimid line)

c. 1000/c. 1592	al-Qāsim al-Manṣūr
1029/1620	Muḥammad al-Muʼayyad I
1054/1654	Ismāʻīl al-Mutawakkil
1087/1676	Muḥammad al-Muʼayyad II

1092/1681	Muḥammad al-Hādī
1097/1686	Muḥammad al-Mahdī
1128/1716	al-Qāsim al-Mutawakkil
1139/1726	al-Ḥusayn al-Manṣūr, *first reign*
1139/1726	Muḥammad al-Hādī al-Majīd (?)
1140/1728	al-Ḥusayn al-Manṣūr, *second reign*
1160/1747	al-ʿAbbās al-Mahdī (?)
c. 1190/c. 1776	ʿAlī al-Manṣūr
1221/1806	Aḥmad al-Mahdī (?)
?	ʿAlī al-Manṣūr, *second reign?*
1257/1841	al-Qāsim al-Mahdī
1261/1845	Muḥammad Yaḥyā
1289/1872	*Ottoman capture of Ṣanʿāʾ*
1308/1890	Ḥamīd-ad-Dīn Yaḥyā
1322/1904	Yaḥyā Maḥmūd al-Mutawakkil
1367/1948	Sayf-al-Islām Aḥmad
1382/1962	Muḥammad Badr

The Zaydīs were a moderate branch of the Shīʿa, who held that the caliph ʿAlī had been designated by the Prophet Muḥammad as Imām of the Community through his personal merits rather than through a divine ordinance or *naṣṣ*, and also that the Fifth Imām of the Shīʿa should rightfully have been not Muḥammad al-Bāqir but his brother Zayd, martyred during the reign of the Umayyad caliph Hishām. The descendants and partisans of Zayd later won over by their propaganda the peoples of Daylam and the south-western coastlands of the Caspian Sea, a region sufficiently inaccessible (and, indeed, hardly as yet Islamised) for this work to be carried on without impediment. The region of the Yemen in the south-western corner of the Arabian peninsula was likewise remote from control by the ʿAbbāsid caliphs, and here, Tarjumān-ad-Dīn al-Qāsim b. Ibrāhīm Ṭabāṭabā, a descendant of the caliph ʿAlī's son al-Ḥasan, established himself during al-Maʾmūn's reign. The dynastic name 'Rassid' is said to be geographical in origin, stemming from an estate in the Ḥijāz called ar-Rass and held by al-Qāsim.

The Rassids thus settled at Ṣaʿda in the northern Yemen, and maintained themselves there against the local Khārijīs, Qarāmiṭa and other opponents of their rule. As well as possessing Ṣaʿda, they frequently held Ṣanʿāʾ also. Over the next century,

the Yemen remained the centre of the Zaydī *da'wa* or religious propaganda, with missionaries going out to the Caspian provinces and to other parts of the Islamic world. Ṣan'ā' was taken by the Ṣulayḥids in the second half of the eleventh century, and in the next century it was held by Arab chiefs of the Banū-Hamdān for fifty years; only briefly were Zaydī fortunes restored under Aḥmad al-Mutawakkil, a descendant of the tenth-century Imām Aḥmad an-Nāṣir. The Ayyūbid conquest of the Yemen in 569/1174 considerably restricted the authority of the imāms; they revived somewhat under the first Rasūlids, until internal disputes and civil strife brought about the eclipse of their power in the Yemen.

After this time, the names of various imāms are known, but the succession seems to have been interrupted by the intrusion of several imāms from other Ḥasanid lines and of various rival claimants or anti-imāms. The Ottoman Turks occupied the Yemen from 923/1517 to 1045/1635, and in the sixteenth century, more than one imām was carried off to Istanbul by the Turkish authorities. It was not until the Turks left the Yemen and Ṣan'ā' was re-occupied by the Zaydīs, that a fresh line of imāms, stemming from the Rassid Imām Yūsuf al-Manṣūr ad-Dā'ī, began to rule there. It is this line which has persisted in the Yemen, despite a second Ottoman occupation of Ṣan'ā' from 1289/1872 till 1308/1890, down to the present time.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Sachau, 22; Zambaur, 122-4 and Table B. EI[1] 'Zaidīya', 'Ṣan'ā'' (R. Strothmann).

⟨30⟩
The Ṣulayḥids
439-532/1047-1138
Yemen

439/1047	ʿAlī b. Muḥammad	
459/1067	al-Mukarram Aḥmad b. ʿAlī	
477/1084	al-Mukarram al-Aṣghar ʿAlī b. Aḥmad	under the supreme rule of as-Sayyida Arwā
c. 484/c. 1091	al-Manṣūr Sabaʾ b. Aḥmad b. al-Muẓaffar	under the supreme rule of as-Sayyida Arwā
492-532/1099-1138	as-Sayyida Arwā	
	Power assumed by the Zurayʿids or Banū-l-Karam of Aden	

After the early Arab conquests, the Arabian peninsula became a backwater politically and culturally. It has been already noted that the Yemen, because of its remoteness from the seat of the ʿAbbāsid caliphate in Iraq, soon became a centre of Shīʿī heterodoxy, especially of the Zaydīs. It was also fertile ground for the reception of the extremer propaganda of Sevener or Ismāʿīli Shīʿism, and once the Fāṭimids became established in Egypt towards the end of the tenth century, with the Holy Places in the Ḥijāz acknowledging the Fāṭimid caliphs, connections between Egypt and the Yemen became close.

The Ṣulayḥids ruled in the Yemen as adherents of the Ismāʿīlī *daʿwa* and as nominal vassals of the Fāṭimids. ʿAlī b. Muḥammad, a member of the South Arabian tribe of Hamdān and the son of a local qāḍī or judge, became the deputy of the chief Fāṭimid *dāʿī* in the Yemen, Sulaymān az-Zawāḥī, and was then able to set up a principality in the mountains. He defeated the Abyssinian slave dynasty of the Najāḥids of the Tihāma or coastlands, in 455/1063 he captured Ṣanʿāʾ from the Zaydī imāms and invaded the Ḥijāz, and in the next year he took Aden from the Banū-Maʿn. Under his son al-Mukarram Aḥmad, the Ṣulayḥid dominions reached their maximum extent, yet these conquests could not be held beyond the eleventh century. The Najāḥids revived, Aden was usually independent, and the

Zaydī imāms remained at Ṣa'da north of Ṣan'ā'. From the latter part of Aḥmad's reign until her own death at 92 in 532/1138, effective authority was exercised by his capable consort, the Queen as-Sayyida Arwā, who moved the Ṣulayḥid capital from Ṣan'ā' to Dhū-Jibla. Towards the end, power passed to the Zuray'ids, who were to hold it till the advent in 569/1174 of the Ayyūbid Tūrān-Shāh (see above, p. 60), although odd Ṣulayḥid princes held fortresses in the Yemen down to the end of the twelfth century.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Lane Poole, 94, Zambaur, 118-19 (both very inaccurate).
EI[1] 'Ṣulaiḥīs' (F. Krenkow).
Najm-ad-Dīn 'Umāra al-Yamanī, *Ta'rīkh al-Yaman*, in H. C. Kay, *Yaman, its early mediaeval history* (London 1892), 19-64.
al-Hamdānī and al-Juhanī, *aṣ-Ṣulayḥiyyūn wa-l-ḥaraka al-Fāṭimiyya fī-l-Yaman*, with a detailed table at p. 335.

⟨31⟩

The Rasūlids

626-858/1229-1454

Yemen

626/1229 al-Malik al-Manṣūr Nūr-ad-Dīn ʿUmar I
647/1250 al-Malik al-Muẓaffar Shams-ad-Dīn Yūsuf I
694/1295 al-Malik al-Ashraf Mumahhid-ad-Dīn ʿUmar II
696/1296 al-Malik al-Mu'ayyad Hizabr-ad-Dīn Dā'ūd
721/1322 al-Malik al-Mujāhid Sayf-ad-Dīn ʿAlī
764/1363 al-Malik al-Afḍal Ḍirghām-ad-Dīn al-ʿAbbās
778/1377 al-Malik al-Ashraf Mumahhid-ad-Dīn Ismāʿīl I
803/1400 al-Malik an-Nāṣir Ṣalāḥ-ad-Dīn Aḥmad
827/1424 al-Malik al-Manṣūr ʿAbdallāh
830/1427 al-Malik al-Ashraf Ismāʿīl II
831/1428 al-Malik aẓ-Ẓāhir Yaḥyā
842/1439 al-Malik al-Ashraf Ismāʿīl III
845/1442 al-Malik al-Muẓaffar Yūsuf II
846-58/1442-54 period of chaos, in which there were four rival claimants to the throne until in 858/1454 power passed to the Ṭāhirids

The Yemen was, in 569/1174, conquered by the Ayyūbid Tūrān-Shāh, Saladin's brother, and ruled by Ayyūbid princes down to 626/1229, when al-Malik al-Kāmil's son, Ṣalāḥ-ad-Dīn Yūsuf, was forced to abandon the province. Their successors, the Rasūlids, nevertheless continued Ayyūbid policy in the Yemen, imitating Ayyūbid titulature and promoting the cause of Sunnī Islam in this region where, in the mountainous interior at least, there was a long-established Shīʿī tradition. Although the historian of the Rasūlids al-Khazrajī gives Rasūl a genealogy going back to Qaḥṭān, progenitor of the South Arabs, he was in fact a Turkmen of Oghuz origin who had been employed as an envoy (*rasūl*) by the ʿAbbāsid caliph, and a certain number of Turkish features are discernible in the dynasty's history.

Rasūl's grandson, al-Malik al-Manṣūr ʿUmar, made Zabīd in the coastlands his capital, but expanded into the mountains and captured Taʿizz and Ṣanʿāʾ from the Zaydī imāms; the Rasūlids were to retain Ṣanʿāʾ for a century and a half. He also held Mecca, and his kingdom stretched from the Ḥijāz to the Ḥaḍramawt, making the Rasūlids a power of international significance in the Islamic world; an embassy to the Yemen from China is recorded, doubtless stimulated by the Far Eastern trade links of the Ḥaḍramawt. Also, the cultural and political links of the Rasūlids with Ayyūbid and Mamlūk Egypt remained strong. Latterly, the Rasūlids found it hard to retain their hold on the mountainous interior, and after al-Malik an-Nāṣir Aḥmad's death in 827/1424, internal strife and disintegration set in, made worse by revolts of the Rasūlids' slave troops and by the ravages of plague. Finally, the last Rasūlid, al-Malik al-Masʿūd, abdicated in face of the rising power of the Sunnī Ṭāhirids of Laḥij and Aden, and the Ṭāhirids held much of the Yemen down to the Ottoman conquest early in the sixteenth century.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Lane Poole, 99-100; Zambaur, 120.
EI[1] 'Rasūlids' (A. S. Tritton).
al-Khazrajī, *al-ʿUqūd al-luʾluʾiyya fī akhbār ad-dawla ar-Rasūliyya*, text by Shaykh Muḥ. ʿAsal, tr. Sir J. W. Redhouse, *The pearl-strings; a history of the Resúliyy dynasty of Yemen*, Gibb Memorial Series III/1-5 (London 1906-13).

<32>

The Āl Bū-Saʿīd, Sultans of Muscat and then of Zanzibar

1154- /1741-

Oman and Zanzibar

1. United Sultanate

1154/1741	Aḥmad b. Saʿīd
1198/1783	Saʿīd b. Aḥmad
?1200/?1786	Ḥāmid b. Saʿīd
1206/1792	Sulṭān b. Aḥmad
1220/1806	Sālim b. Sulṭān
1220/1806	Saʿīd b. Sulṭān
	Division of the sultanate on Saʿīd's death

2. In Oman

1273/1856	Thuwaynī b. Saʿīd
1282/1866	Sālim b. Thuwaynī
1285/1868	ʿAzzān b. Qays
1287/1870	Turkī b. Saʿīd
1305/1888	Fayṣal b. Turkī
1331/1913	Taymūr b. Fayṣal
1350- /1932-	Saʿīd b. Taymūr

3. In Zanzibar

1273/1856	Majīd b. Saʿīd
1287/1870	Barghash b. Saʿīd
1305/1888	Khalīfa b. Barghash
1307/1890	ʿAlī b. Saʿīd
1310/1893	Ḥāmid
1314/1896	Ḥammūd
1320/1902	ʿAlī b. Ḥammūd
1329/1911	Khalīfa
1380-4/1960-4	ʿAbdallāh b. Khalīfa
	Revolution and incorporation in the Republic of Tanzania

The Bū-Saʿīdīs succeeded to the heritage of the preceding line of Yaʿrubid imāms in both Oman and the East-African coastlands. Aḥmad b. Saʿīd began as governor of Ṣuḥār in Oman,

and then made himself master of the whole region. He adopted the title of imām (*sc.* of the Ibāḍīs, who comprise three-quarters of the Omani population; see on the Ibāḍiyya sect, above, p. 22), possibly in 1163/1749, but his son Saʿīd was the last to use this title, and later rulers simply called themselves sayyids, or sultans to foreigners. Muscat, which eventually became the capital of the Bū-Saʿīdīs, had long been a port of international significance and had played an important rôle in the struggles of the Portuguese and then the Dutch for the commercial control of the Persian Gulf. Sayyid Sulṭān (1206-20/1792-1806) pursued an expansionist policy as far as Baḥrayn island and Bandar Abbas, Hormuz, and Kishm on the southern coasts of Persia. However, the position of the sayyids in the early nineteenth century was menaced by the aggressive Wahhābīs of Najd; they countered this threat by an alliance with Britain, which was concerned that the port of Muscat, lying as it did near the route to India, should be in friendly hands. In 1212/1798 the first treaty with the East India Company was made, and agents of the Company were later stationed at Muscat; in subsequent decades of the nineteenth century, Britain used her influence at Muscat to control and then end the slave trade in the Gulf.

The Yaʿrubid possessions on the East African coast had been largely lost in the wars with Persia of the late eighteenth century, with virtually only Zanzibar, Pemba, and Kilwa remaining to the Bū-Saʿīdīs. But Saʿīd b. Sulṭān during his long reign extended his suzerainty over all the Arab and Swahili colonies from Mogadishu in the north to Cape Delgado in the south. After his death in 1273/1856, the Bū-Saʿīdī dominions were divided into two separate sultanates, based on Muscat and Zanzibar respectively. In 1307/1890 the islands of Zanzibar and Pemba became a British protectorate; the sultanate achieved independence once more in December 1963, but in January 1964 a *coup d'état* ended the sultan's rule, and in April 1964 Zanzibar became linked with Tanganyika in the republic of Tanzania. As for Oman, from c. 1319/c. 1901 onwards, it has been politically disturbed by a separatist movement in the interior, the region behind the Jebel Akhḍar Mts. The present imām of these dissidents, Ghālib, has been financed by Egypt, and in 1957 he attempted an armed uprising against the sultan

in Muscat, who still remains closely linked diplomatically with Britain.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Zambaur, 129 and Table M.
EI[1] 'Maskaṭ', 'Zanzibar' (A. Grohmann); EI[2] 'Bū-Sa'īd' (C. F. Beckingham), with a genealogical table which corrects Zambaur's list in several places.
R. Said-Ruete, 'Die Al-Bu-Said Dynastie in Arabien und Ostafrika', *Der Islam*, XX (1932), 237-46, with a genealogical table (confused) between pp. 216 and 217.

⟨33⟩
The Āl Saʿūd or Wahhābiyya
1159- /1746-
Northern and central Arabia

1159/1746	Muḥammad b. Saʿūd
1179/1765	ʿAbd-al-ʿAzīz I
1218/1803	Saʿūd b. ʿAbd-al-ʿAzīz
1229/1814	ʿAbdallāh I b. Saʿūd
1233-8/1818-22	*Ottoman Turkish occupation*
1238/1823	Turkī
1249/1834	Fayṣal I, *first reign*
1253/1837	Khālid b. Saʿūd
1257/1841	ʿAbdallāh II b. Thunayyān (as a vassal of Muḥammad ʿAlī of Egypt)
1259/1843	Fayṣal I, *second reign*
1282/1865	ʿAbdallāh III b. Fayṣal, *first reign*
1287/1871	Saʿūd b. Fayṣal
1291/1874	ʿAbdallāh III, *second reign*
1305/1887	*conquest by Muḥammad b. Rashīd of Ḥāʾil, ʿAbdallāh remaining as governor of Riyāḍ till 1307/1889*
1307/1889	ʿAbd-ar-Raḥmān b. Fayṣal, as governor in Riyāḍ
1308/1891	Muḥammad b. Fayṣal al-Muṭawwiʿ, as vassal governor under the Rashīdīs
1319/1902	ʿAbd-al-ʿAzīz II
1373/1953	Saʿūd
1384/1964	Fayṣal II

The Wahhābiyya began as a religious and spiritual reform movement in central Arabia or Najd. The founder was Muḥammad b. ʿAbd-al-Wahhāb (died 1206/1791), whose beliefs as set forth in his *ʿAqīda* or creed (preserved in a local history of Najd, the *ʿUnwān al-majd fī taʾrīkh Najd* of ʿUthmān b. ʿAbdallāh b. Bishr) show him as a follower of the conservative and literalist legal and theological ideas of Aḥmad b. Hanbal and Ibn Taymiyya. The unity and transcendence of God is stressed, and great hostility shown to heretical innovations, *bidaʿ*, above all, to popular saint-worship and the survivals of

pre-Islamic veneration of sacred sites and objects. Hence when the Wahhābiyya achieved political and military power in Arabia, they systematically destroyed such things as saints' tombs.

Muḥammad b. ʿAbd-al-Wahhāb was protected by the Najdī chief Muḥammad b. Saʿūd of Darʿiyya, and his reforming enthusiasm became the driving force behind the political expansion of the Saʿūdī family. By the end of the eighteenth century, the whole of Najd had been conquered and Iraq was being raided, culminating in the sack of Karbalāʾ by the Wahhābīs in 1218/1803 as a centre of Shīʿī superstition; and the Holy Cities of the Ḥijāz were seized and purged. The Ottomans were naturally provoked into a reaction, and the Sultan authorised the governor of Egypt Muḥammad ʿAlī to deal with the Wahhābīs; hence in 1233/1818 the latter's son Ibrāhīm took Darʿiyya and razed it to the ground, deported the Saʿūdī amīr to Istanbul for execution and occupied the Ḥijāz. The Saʿūdīs revived somewhat under Turkī and especially under Fayṣal I, but then became hard pressed, especially as Najd was, in the last years of the nineteenth century, dominated by the rival Rashīdī family of Ḥāʾil, with the Saʿūdīs compelled to take refuge in Kuwait. The resurgence of the family in the twentieth century is connected with the great figure of ʿAbd-al-ʿAzīz b. Saʿūd. He overthrew the Āl Rashīd (who had supported the Turkish cause in the First World War), prevented the Sharīf Ḥusayn from establishing himself in Mecca as caliph, and in 1930 had himself crowned in Mecca as king of the Ḥijāz and Najd, thus establishing the modern Saʿūdī Arabian kingdom firmly in control of the greater part of the peninsula.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Zambaur, 124 and Table L.

EI[1] 'Ibn Saʿūd' (J. H. Mordtmann), 'Wahhābīya' (D. S. Margoliouth).

R. Hartmann, 'Die Wahhābiten', ZDMG, LXXVIII (1924), 176–213.

H. St John Philby, *Arabian jubilee* (London 1952), with detailed genealogical tables on pp. 250–71.

R. B. Winder, *Saudi Arabia in the nineteenth century* (London 1965).

FIVE

THE IRANIAN WORLD AND THE CAUCASUS BEFORE THE SELJUQS

<34>
The Bāwandids
45-750/665-1349
Caspian coastlands

1. Line of Kā'ūsiyya (Ṭabaristān)

45/665 Bāw
60/680 interregnum of Walāsh
68/688 Surkhāb I
98/717 Mihr Mardān
138/755 Surkhāb II
155/772 Sharwīn I
181/797 Shahriyār I
210/825 Shāpūr or Ja'far
222/837 Qārin I
253/867 Rustam I
282/895 Sharwīn II
318/930 Shahriyār II
? Rustam II
355/966 Dārā
358/969 Shahriyār III
396/1006 Rustam III
449-66/1057-74 Qārin II

2. Line of Ispahbadiyya (Ṭabaristān and Gīlān)

466/1074 Ḥusām-ad-Dawla Shahriyār
503/1110 Najm-ad-Dawla Qārin
511/1117 Shams-al-Mulūk Rustam
511/1118 'Alā'-ad-Dawla 'Alī

534/1140	Shāh Ghāzī Rustam I
558/1163	'Alā'-ad-Dawla or Sharaf-al-Mulūk Ḥasan
567/1172	Ḥusām-ad-Dawla Ardashīr
602-6/1206-10	Nāṣir-ad-Dawla or Shams-al-Mulūk Shāh Ghāzī Rustam II

3. Line of Kīnkhwāriyya (Vassals of the Mongols)

635/1238	Ḥusām-ad-Dawla Ardashīr
647/1249	Shams-al-Mulūk Muḥammad
665/1267	'Alā'-ad-Dawla 'Alī
675/1276	Tāj-ad-Dawla Yazdagird
698/1299	Nāṣir-ad-Dawla Shahriyār
714/1314	Rukn-ad-Dawla Kay Khusraw
728/1328	Sharaf-al-Mulūk
734-50/1334-49	Fakhr-ad-Dawla Ḥasan *Power seized in Mazandaran by the Afrāsiyāb family*

The Caspian coastlands of Gīlān and Ṭabaristān and the hills inland, protected as they are by the mighty barrier of the Elburz Mts, have always been a refuge area for peoples and ideas. Ethnic splinters, aberrant religious beliefs, ancient languages, scripts, and social ways have often survived there long after they have disappeared from the more accessible parts of Persia. For many centuries after the coming of Islam to Persia, these regions sheltered various petty dynasties whose roots lay in the Sāsānid past; one of these, the Bāduspānids, persisted right down to the time of the Ṣafavid Shāh 'Abbās II (*sc.* the end of the sixteenth century), when the line was suppressed and the Caspian provinces fully integrated with the rest of Persia.

The most significant of these local Iranian dynasties was perhaps that of the Bāwandids of Ṭabaristān (a region which from the late eleventh century is generally called Māzandarān), whom circumstances in the twelfth century allowed to play a rôle in Persia outside the immediate Caspian region. The survival of this dynasty for 700 years until Il-Khānid times well shows how the region's isolation allowed a degree of family continuity unusual in the Islamic world at large. The Bāwandid rulers had the Iranian title of *Ispahbad* or 'Military leader', and

were also often referred to as *Mulūk al-Jibāl* 'Lords of the mountains', for although they at times lost their foothold on the plains, they managed to hold on to some authority in the mountains.

The first line, that of the Kā'ūsiyya, were in the tenth century linked by marriage with the Būyids and Ziyārids, and latterly fell under the control of the Ziyārid Qābūs b. Vushmagīr; but they survived into the next century in the mountains, when the Caspian coastlands were overrun by the Seljuqs. In the ensuing years, the second or Ispahbadiyya line of the Bāwandids successfully prevented the Great Seljuqs from extending their direct authority into Ṭabaristān; they sheltered various Seljuq claimants to the throne and made several high-level marriages with the Seljuqs. The decline of Seljuq power permitted the vigorous and ambitious Shāh Ghāzī Rustam I to become a major figure in the politics of northern Persia; he pursued an independent policy aimed at the expansion of his principality south of the Elburz. However, the pressure of the Ismā'īlīs of the Elburz and then of the Khwārazm-Shāhs brought this line to an end in 606/1210, and Māzandarān passed briefly under Khwārazmian control. Even so, the resilient Bāwandids re-appeared thirty years later as a third line, that of the Kīnkhwāriyya. They ruled as vassals of the Mongols, until in 750/1349 another local Māzandarānī family, that of Kiyā Afrāsiyāb Chulābī, overthrew them and ended their rule for ever.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Justi, 431-2; Sachau, 5-7; Zambaur, 187-9.
M. Rabino, 'Les dynasties du Māzandarān de l'an 50 avant l'Hégire à l'an 1006 de l'Hégire (572 à 1597-1598) d'après les chroniques locales', JA, CCXXVIII (1936), 409-37, with a genealogical table at p. 416.

⟨35⟩
The Musāfirids or Sallārids or Kangarids
c. 304–c. 483/c. 916–c. 1090
Daylam and Āzerbayjan

before 304/916	Muḥammad b. Musāfir, lord of Ṭārom in Daylam
330/941	Marzubān I b. Muḥammad (in Azerbayjan and Arrān)
330/941	Wahsūdān b. Muḥammad (in Ṭārom)
346/957	Justān I b. Marzubān (in Azerbayjan)
349/960	Ibrāhīm I b. Marzubān (in Azerbayjan till d. 373/983)
355/966	Marzubān II b. Ismā'īl b. Wahsūdān (in Ṭārom till 374/984)
387/997	Ibrāhīm II b. Marzubān II (re-established at Ṭārom, still alive 420/1029)
?	Justān II b. Ibrāhīm (reigning 437/1045)
?	Musāfir b. Ibrāhīm (reigning 454/1062)
	?[*Dynasty extinguished by the Ismā'īlīs of Alamūt*

The history of north-western Persia in the period between the rule of such Arab governors as the Sājids of Azerbayjan and the Yazīdids of Darband (the later Sharvān-Shāhs), and that of the incoming Turkish Seljuqs, is spanned by the upsurge there of indigenous Iranian peoples. Whereas the Daylamī Ziyārids and Būyids directed their efforts at the rich lands of western and southern Persia and Iraq, the Daylamī Musāfirids expanded northwards into Azerbaijan, where the collapse of the Sājids had left a power vacuum. The name 'Sallārids' is also found for the Musāfirids, but the Persian scholar Kasravī claimed plausibly that the family's original name was that of the Kangarids.

Muḥammad b. Musāfir (*Musāfir* probably < Persian *Asfār/Asvār*) held the key fortresses of Ṭārom and Samīrān in Daylam, and from these he increased his power at the expense of the older Daylamī dynasty of the Justānids. After Muḥammad's death in 330/941, the family split for a time into two branches. One under Wahsūdān remained in Daylam, whilst the other under his brother Marzubān moved northwards and westwards

into Azerbayjan and Arrān and even to Darband on the Caspian coast. This latter branch failed, however, to maintain itself in face of the growing power of the Rawwādids of Tabrīz, and the last Musāfirid territories in Azerbayjan were lost by 374/984. Furthermore, the Ṭārom branch was hard pressed by the Būyid Fakhr-ad-Dawla of Ray, and for a time lost Samīrān to him. Their fortunes revived after his death, and they were able to occupy Zanjān and other towns to the south of Daylam. But the dynasty's history now becomes obscure and fragmentary. Ibrāhīm II b. Marzubān was briefly dispossessed of Ṭārom in 420/1029 by the Ghaznavids; later, the family became vassals of the Seljuq Toghrïl Beg. After this, comes only silence, but it is probable that the last obscure Musāfirids were extinguished by the aggressive Ismāʿīlīs of Alamūt.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Justi, 441 (linking the Musāfirids with the Rawwādids under the common designation of Wahsūdānids).
Sachau, 14; Zambaur, 180.
EI[1] 'Musāfirids' (V. Minorsky).
R. Vasmer, 'Zur Chronologie der Ǧastāniden und Sallāriden', *Islamica*, III (1927), 165-89, 482-5, with a genealogical table between pp. 184 and 185 correcting Zambaur.
Sayyid Aḥmad Kasravī, *Shahriyārān-i gum-nām*[2] (Tehran 1335/1957), I, 52-120.
V. Minorsky, *Studies in Caucasian history* (London 1953).

⟨36⟩
The Rawwādids
early 4th century-463/early 10th century-1071

Azerbayjan

?	Muḥammad b. Ḥusayn ar-Rawwādī
c. 340/c. 951	Ḥusayn I b. Muḥammad
?	Abū-l-Hayjā' Mamlān I or Muḥammad
391/1000	Abū-Naṣr Ḥusayn II b. Mamlān
416/1025	Wahsūdān b. Mamlān
451/1059	Mamlān II b. Wahsūdān
463/1071	*Seljuq occupation of Azerbayjan*
?	Aḥmadīl b. Ibrāhīm b. Wahsūdān (d. in Marāgha 510/1116)
	Aḥmadīlī Atabegs of Marāgha

Although Daylamīs were most prominent in the upsurge in northern Persia of Iranian peoples in the tenth century, the rôle of other races was not negligible. The Shaddādids of Arrān were probably of Kurdish origin, whilst the Rawwādids of Tabrīz and Azerbayjan were in the tenth century accounted Kurdish. In reality, it seems that the family were originally Arabs from the Yemenī tribe of Azd. In the early 'Abbāsid period, members of the Rawwādid family had been governors of Tabriz, but over the next century or so, the family became thoroughly Kurdicised, and such names as 'Mamlān' and 'Aḥmadīl' are characteristic Kurdish deformations of the familiar Arabic names 'Muḥammad' and 'Aḥmad'.

Like their Musāfirid neighbours, the Rawwādids took advantage of the confused state of post-Sājid Azerbayjan. Despite help from the Būyids, that branch of the Musāfirids which had installed itself in Azerbayjan was gradually driven out by Abū-l-Hayjā' Mamlān, so that by 374/984 all the region was in Rawwādid hands. In the eleventh century, the most outstanding member of the dynasty was Wahsūdān b. Mamlān. With the help of Kurdish neighbours, he successfully coped with the first incursions of Oghuz Turkmens, but in 446/1054 submitted to Toghril. Thereafter, the Rawwādids ruled as Seljuq vassals, until in 463/1071, Alp-Arslan returned from his Anatolian campaign and deposed Mamlān b. Wahsūdān. However, at

least one later member of the family is known, Aḥmadīl of Marāgha, and his name was perpetuated by a line of his Turkish ghulāms, called after him the Aḥmadīlīs, who ruled in Marāgha as Atabegs until the early thirteenth century.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Justi, 441.

Zambaur, 180 (like Justi, taking the Rawwādids to be a branch of the Musāfirids).

EI[1] 'Marāgha', 'Tabrīz' (V. Minorsky).

Aḥmad Kasravī, *Shahriyārān-i gum-nām*[2], II, 130–45.

V. Minorsky, *Studies in Caucasian history*.

<37>

The Shaddādids

c. 340–571/c. 951–1174

Arrān and eastern Armenia

1. Main line in Ganja and Dvīn

c. 340/c. 951	Muḥammad b. Shaddād (in Dvīn)
360/971	ʿAlī Lashkarī I b. Muḥammad (in Ganja)
368/978	Marzubān b. Muḥammad
375/985	Faḍl I b. Muḥammad
422/1031	Abūl-Fat'ḥ Mūsā
425/1034	ʿAlī Lashkarī II
440/1049	Anūshirvān b. Lashkarī
441/1049	Abū-l-Asvār Shāvur I b. Faḍl (from 413/1022 in Dvīn, from 441/1049 in Ganja)
459/1067	Faḍl II b. Shāvur
466–8/1073–5	Faḍl III (Faḍlūn) b. Faḍl
	Occupation of Arrān by the Seljuq general Savtigin

2. Ānī branch

c. 465/c. 1072	Manūchihr b. Shāvur I
c. 512/c. 1118	Abū-l-Asvār Shāvur II
518/1124	*Georgian occupation*
c. 519/c. 1125	Faḍl IV (Faḍlūn) b. Shāvur II
?	Maḥmūd
c. 525/c. 1131	Khūshchihr
?	Shaddād
550/1155	Faḍl V
556/1161	*Georgian occupation*
559–71/1164–74	Shāhanshāh
	Georgian occupation

The Shaddādids were another of the dynasties which arose in northern Persia during the 'Daylamī interlude', and it is probable that they were of Kurdish origin. The north-western corner of the Iranian world and the adjoining Caucasus region have for much of recorded history been a most confused region ethnically and linguistically. The Shaddādids' need to find a

place for themselves between the Daylamīs of Azerbayjan on one side, and the Christian Armenians and Georgians on the other, doubtless explains why Daylamī names like Lashkarī and Armenian ones like Ashot are found in the Shaddādids' genealogy.

In the middle years of the tenth century, the Kurdish adventurer Muḥammad b. Shaddād established himself at Dvīn (near modern Erivan in the Georgian SSR), a town at that time in the possession of the Musāfirids. Despite an attempt to secure Byzantine aid, Muḥammad could not prevent the Daylamīs from regaining Dvīn, but in 360/971 his sons successfully ejected the Musāfirids from Ganja in Arrān (the region of eastern Transcaucasia between the Kur and Araxes rivers), and Ganja then became the capital of the main line of Shaddādids for a century. They now undertook with vigour the defence of Islam in this region, fighting the Georgian Bagratids, various Armenian princes, the Byzantines, and the Alans or Ossetians and the Rūs from over the Caucasus. In particular, Abū-l-Asvār Shāvur I, most eminent of the Shaddādids, acquired a great contemporary renown as a fighter for the faith. The Shaddādids submitted to Toghril and the Seljuqs when the latter first appeared in the Caucasus region, but in 468/1075 the Turkish slave general Savtigin invaded Arrān and compelled Faḍl or Faḍlūn III to yield his ancestral territories. However, another branch was installed in Ānī, capital of the Armenian Bagratids, after its capture by Sultan Alp-Arslan in 465/1072, and it lasted through many vicissitudes down to the Georgian resurgence in the second half of the twelfth century; a scion of the Shaddādids in Ānī is still mentioned as late as 595/1199.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Justi, 443; Sachau, 14; Zambaur, 184-5. (All incomplete).

EI[1] 'Banū Shaddād' (Sir E. D. Ross).

Aḥmad Kasravī, *Shahriyārān-i gum-nām*[2], III, 270-332, with a table at pp. 328 and 329.

V. Minorsky, *Studies in Caucasian history*.

⟨38⟩
The Ziyārids
315–c. 483/927–c. 1090
Ṭabaristān and Gurgān

315/927	Mardāwīj b. Ziyār
323/935	Ẓahīr-ad-Dawla Vushmagīr
356/967	Ẓahīr-ad-Dawla Bīsutūn
367/978	Shams-al-Ma'ālī Qābūs
402/1012	Falak-al-Ma'ālī Manūchihr
420/1029	Anūshirvān
441/1049	'Unṣur-al-Ma'ālī Kay Kā'ūs
?-c. 483/?-c. 1090	Gīlān Shāh

In the early years of the tenth century, the backward and remote mountain region of Daylam at the south-western corner of the Caspian Sea sent forth large numbers of its menfolk as soldiers of fortune in the armies of the caliphate and elsewhere. The Ziyārids arose from one of the fiercest of these Daylamī condottieri, Mardāwīj b. Ziyār, who on the rebellion of one Asfār, a general in the Sāmānid armies, took the opportunity to seize most of northern Persia. His power soon extended as far south as Iṣfahān and Hamadān, but in 323/935 he was murdered by his own Turkish troops and his transient empire fell apart. Only in the Caspian provinces did his brother Vushmagīr retain a foothold, acknowledging the Sāmānids as his overlords. In the latter half of the tenth century, the Ziyārids played some part in the Būyid-Sāmānid struggles for power in northern Persia, and in Qābūs b. Vushmagīr they produced a ruler of considerable literary taste and ability. A point which marks the Ziyārids off from almost all the other Daylamī dynasties was their adherence, at least latterly, to Sunnī and not Shī'ī Islam.

In the early eleventh century, the Ziyārids had to acknowledge Ghaznavid suzerainty, the two families being linked by marriage alliances, but their history after 421/1030 is extremely obscure. The Seljuqs took over the Caspian coastlands of Gurgān and Ṭabaristān, but members of the Ziyārid dynasty seem to have survived in the less accessible inland mountain regions; one of the last amīrs, Kay Kā'ūs, is famous as the

author of a celebrated 'Mirror for Princes' in Persian, the *Qābūs-nāma*. His son Gīlān Shāh was the last known member of the line to rule; he was apparently overthrown by the Ismā'īlīs of the Elburz Mts, and after him, the dynasty disappears from history.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Lane Poole, 136-7; Justi, 441.
Zambaur, 210-11; EI[1] 'Ziyārids' (Cl. Huart).
(All four confused and unreliable on the chronology of the later Ziyārids).
C.E. Bosworth, 'On the chronology of the later Ziyārids in Gurgān and Ṭabaristān', *Der Islam*, XL (1964), 25-34.

<39>

The Būyids or Buwayhids
320-454/932-1062
Persia and Iraq

1. Line in Fārs and Khūzistān

322/934	'Imād-ad-Dawla 'Alī
338/949	'Aḍud-ad-Dawla Fanā-Khusraw
372/983	Sharaf-ad-Dawla Shīrzīl
380/990	Ṣamṣām-ad-Dawla Marzubān
388/998	Bahā'-ad-Dawla Fīrūz
403/1012	Sulṭān-ad-Dawla
412/1021	Musharrif-ad-Dawla Ḥasan
415/1024	'Imād-ad-Dīn Marzubān
440/1048	al-Malik ar-Raḥīm Khusraw-Fīrūz
447-54/1055-62	Fūlād-Sutūn (in Fārs only)
	Power in Fārs seized by the Shabānkāra'ī Kurdish chief Faḍlūya

2. Line in Kirmān

324/936	Mu'izz-ad-Dawla Aḥmad
338/949	'Aḍud-ad-Dawla Fanā-Khusraw
372/983	Ṣamṣām-ad-Dawla Marzubān
388/998	Bahā'-ad-Dawla Fīrūz
403/1012	Qiwām-ad-Dawla
419-40/1028-48	'Imād-ad-Dīn Marzubān
	Seljuq line of Qāwurd

3. Line in Jibāl

320/932	'Imad-ad-Dawla 'Alī
335-66/947-77	Rukn-ad-Dawla Ḥasan

(*a*) Branch in Hamadān and Iṣfahān

366/977	Mu'ayyid-ad-Dawla Būya
373/983	Fakhr-ad-Dawla 'Alī
387/997	Shams-ad-Dawla
412-c.419/1021-c.1028	Samā'-ad-Dawla (under Kākūyid suzerainty)

(*b*) Branch in Ray

366/977	Fakhr-ad-Dawla 'Alī
387-420/997-1029	Majd-ad-Dawla Rustam
	Ghaznavid conquest

4. Line in Iraq

334/945	Mu'izz-ad-Dawla Aḥmad
356/967	'Izz-ad-Dawla Bakhtiyār
367/978	'Aḍud-ad-Dawla Fanā-Khusraw
372/983	Ṣamṣ'ām-ad-Dawla Marzubān
376/987	Sharaf-ad-Dawla Shīrzīl
379/989	Bahā'-ad-Dawla Fīrūz
403/1012	Sulṭān-ad-Dawla
412/1021	Musharrif-ad-Dawla Ḥasan
416/1025	Jalāl-ad-Dawla Shīrzīl
435/1044	'Imād-ad-Dīn al-Marzubān
440-7/1048-55	al-Malik ar-Raḥīm Khusraw-Fīrūz
	Seljuq occupation of Baghdad

The Būyids were the most powerful and territorially extensive of those dynasties flourishing during what Vladimir Minorsky has called 'the Daylamī interlude' of Iranian history, *sc.* the tenth and early eleventh centuries, before the arrival of the Seljuqs. For reasons which are unclear, but which were probably social and religious rather than political, the early years saw the beginning, or perhaps only the intensification, of a great migration of Daylamīs from their homeland. One of their successful military leaders, Mardāwīj b. Ziyār, founded the line of the Ziyārids, and it was in his armies that the Būyids first achieved fame.

The eldest of the three Būyid brothers, 'Alī, held Iṣfahān at the time of Mardāwīj's assassination, and shortly afterwards, he seized the whole of Fārs, whilst Ḥasan held Jibāl and Aḥmad Kirmān and Khūzistān. In 334/945 Aḥmad entered Baghdad, and the 'Abbāsids began a 110 years' period of tutelage under Būyid amīrs (these last normally held the title of *Amīr al-Umarā'* 'Supreme commander'). In the third quarter of the century, Aḥmad's son 'Aḍud-ad-Dawla united under himself all the Būyid possessions in Iraq, southern Persia, and even

Oman, and under this ruler the Būyid dynasty achieved its greatest measure of unity and effectiveness. 'Aḍud-ad-Dawla pursued a vigorously expansionist policy, both in the west against the Ḥamdānids of al-Jazīra, and in the east against the Ziyārids of Ṭabaristān and the Sāmānids of Khurasan. However, a patrimonial conception of power, doubtless stemming from the tribal past in Daylam, normally prevailed amongst the Būyids, and political fragmentation resulted. Whilst a strong ruler like 'Aḍud-ad-Dawla headed the family, a certain sense of solidarity prevailed, but after his death there was much civil strife within the dynasty. This disunity in the first place facilitated Maḥmūd of Ghazna's annexation of Ray and Jibāl from the Būyids in 420/1029, and then left them weakened in the face of the westwards drive of the Seljuq Toghril, who was able to utilise orthodox Sunnī sentiment and to claim that he was liberating Iraq and western Persia from the heretics. Baghdad was occupied in 447/1055, but the Būyid Amīr of Fārs retained power for seven more years, till his lands were seized by the local Shabānkāra'ī Kurds, only to fall into the Seljuqs' hands shortly afterwards.

Like most of the Daylamīs, the Būyids were Shī'is of the moderate Twelver or Ithnā-'Ashariyya persuasion. The traditional Shī'ī festivals were introduced into their territories, and during their time, a certain systematisation and intellectualisation of Shī'ī theology, previously somewhat vague and emotional in content, took place. Yet their Shī'ism was probably also a manifestation of anti-Arab, Iranian national feeling; in this connection, the attempts to provide them with a respectable genealogy back to the Sāsānids and their adoption in Persia of the old imperial title of *Shāhanshāh* should be noted. The caliphs' political power and material resources were inevitably circumscribed, yet the Būyids made no attempt to extinguish the caliphate, and they showed themselves hostile to their political rivals, the Ismā'īlī Shī'ī Fāṭimids. Culturally, the Būyids of the second and subsequent generations became highly appreciative of Arabic and Persian literature, and some of the greatest scholars of the age, including the poet al-Mutanabbī and the anthologist Abū-l-Faraj al-Iṣfahānī, worked under their protection.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Lane Poole, 139-44; Justi, 442.
Zambaur, 212-13 and Table Q.
H. Bowen, 'The last Buwayhids', JRAS (1929), 229-45.
EI[2] 'Buwayhids' (Cl. Cahen).

⟨40⟩

The Kākūyids or Kākwayhids

398-443/1008-51 independent rulers;
thereafter, feudatories of the Seljuqs
Central and western Persia

398/1008	'Alā'-ad-Dawla Muḥammad b. Dushmanziyār
433-43/1041-51	Abū-Manṣūr Farāmurz (in Iṣfahān)
433-c. 440/1041-c. 1048	Abū-Kālījār Garshāsp I (in Hamadān and Nihāwand)
?-488/?-1095	Abū-Manṣūr 'Alī (in Yazd)
488-c. 513/1095-c. 1119	Abū-Kālījār Garshasp II (in Yazd)

The Kākūyids were a Daylamī dynasty who flourished in western Persia during the decline of the Būyids, only to lose their independence and be reduced to vassalage by the rising power of the Seljuqs. Dushmanziyār was a Daylamī who received the town of Shahriyār from the Būyids of Ray and Jibāl. His son 'Alā-ad-Dawla Muḥammad was known as Ibn-Kākūya, and the sources explain that *kākū* means in Daylamī dialect 'maternal uncle', for Muḥammad was the Būyid Amīr Majd-ad-Dawla's maternal uncle. In 398/1008 he became governor of Iṣfahān, and soon took over Hamadān and other towns of western Persia; with the rich revenues of this region he built up an effective mercenary army and made the Kākūyids a power of some significance for a while. At his court, he encouraged poets and scholars, and the philosopher Ibn-Sīnā (Avicenna) served as his vizier till his death. When Maḥmūd of Ghazna conquered Ray in 420/1029, Ibn-Kākūya was forced to submit; but the Ghaznavids found it difficult to retain these distant acquisitions, and at one point, Ibn-Kākūya himself occupied Ray.

The invasions of the Oghuz and their flocks changed the whole political situation in Persia and forced the Kākūyids, like the other Daylamī powers, on to the defensive. When Ibn-Kākūya died in 433/1041, his son Farāmurz succeeded in Iṣfahān, but was forced to recognise the Seljuqs as masters; when Toghrïl finally captured Iṣfahān in 443/1051 and made it his capital, Farāmurz received in exchange Abarqūh and Yazd. His brother Garshāsp had followed his father in Hamadān and Nihāwand, but was unable to withstand the Oghuz and fled to the Būyids of Fārs. The last Kākūyids seem to have adapted themselves well to the Great Seljuq régime. 'Alī b. Farāmurz succeeded his father in Yazd and married a daughter of Chaghrï Beg; the last member of the family to be mentioned in the sources, Garshāsp b. 'Alī, married the sister of Sultans Muḥammad and Sanjar.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Lane Poole, 145; Justi, 445.
Zambaur, 216-17; EI[1] 'Kākōyids' (Cl. Huart).
G. C. Miles, 'The coinage of the Kākwayhid dynasty', *Iraq*, V (1938), 89-104.
idem, 'Notes on Kākwayhid coins', *American Numismatic Society, Museum Notes*, IX (1960), 231-6.

⟨41⟩
The Ṭāhirids
205–59/821–73
Khurasan

205/821 Ṭāhir I b. al-Ḥusayn, called Dhū-l-Yamīnayn
207/822 Ṭalḥa
213/828 ʿAbdallāh
230/845 Ṭāhir II
248–59/862–73 Muḥammad
Ṣaffārids and Sāmānids

Ṭāhir b. al-Ḥusayn was of Persian *mawlā* or client descent. He rose to favour under al-Maʾmūn as commander of the latter's forces in the fratricidal war against al-Amīn in 194/810, and after the fall of Baghdad, became governor of that city and of al-Jazīra. Finally, he was appointed governor of Persia and the east. Just before his death, he had started to omit al-Maʾmūn's name from the Friday *khuṭba* or sermon, which was tantamount to an act of rebellion or declaration of independence; but the caliph handed on the governorship to Ṭāhir's son Ṭalḥa, being unable to appoint anyone more reliable to the office. Henceforth, the Ṭāhirids ruled from Nishapur in virtual independence, whilst continuing to forward tribute regularly to Baghdad (the Turks in this tribute became some of the mainstays of the caliphs' professional slave armies). Their strong Sunnī orthodoxy and their favour towards the established Iranian and Arab landed and military classes assured them of support at the top level, although they also had the reputation of protecting the interests of the common people, of encouraging agriculture and building, and of patronising scholars and poets. At the same time as the principal line of Ṭāhirids ruled in Khurasan, other members of the family continued to fill the important post of commander of the garrison (*Ṣāḥib ash-Shurta*) in Baghdad until the early tenth century.

In Khurasan, the main political and military efforts of the Ṭāhirids were aimed at keeping in check Shīʿī *dāʿīs* or propagandists in the Caspian provinces, and at combatting the growing power of the Ṣaffārids in Sīstān, an administrative depend-

ency of Khurasan. In this last, however, they failed. The last Ṭāhirid to rule in Khurasan, Muḥammad b. Ṭāhir II, was inferior in ability to his predecessors, and in 259/873 he lost Nishapur to Ya'qūb b. Layth. He was re-appointed to the governorship in 271/885, but was never able to take up the job properly, and he died in the early tenth century.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Lane Poole, 128; Justi, 436; Sachau, 19-20.
Zambaur, 197-8 (N.B. the Ṭāhir III b. Muḥammad listed by Zambaur as the last member of the dynasty to rule in Khurasan is attached by R. Vasmer, 'Über die Münzen der Ṣaffāriden und ihrer Gegner in Fārs und Ḥurāsān', *Numismatische Zeitschrift*, LXIII [1930], 147-52, to the Ṣaffārids).
EI[1] 'Ṭāhirids' (W. Barthold).
Sa'īd Nafīsī, *Ta'rīkh-i khāndān-i Ṭāhirī. I Ṭāhir b. Ḥusayn* (Tehran 1335/1956), with a detailed genealogical table at the end.

⟨42⟩
The Sāmānids
204-395/819-1005
Khurasan and Transoxania

204/819	Aḥmad I b. Asad b. Sāmān, governor of Farghāna
250/864	Naṣr I b. Aḥmad, originally governor of Samarqand
279/892	Ismāʿīl I b. Aḥmad
295/907	Aḥmad II b. Ismāʿīl
301/914	al-Amīr as Saʿīd Naṣr II
331/943	al-Amīr al-Ḥamīd Nūḥ I
343/954	al-Amīr al-Muʾayyad ʿAbd-al-Malik I
350/961	al-Amīr as-Sadīd Manṣūr I
365/976	al-Amīr ar-Riḍā Nūḥ II
387/997	Manṣūr II
389/999	ʿAbd-al-Malik II
390-5/1000-5	Ismāʿīl II al-Muntaṣir
	Division of territories amongst Qarakhanids (Transoxania) and Ghaznavids (Khurasan)

The founder of the Sāmānid line was one Sāmān-Khudā, a *dihqān* or local landowner in the Balkh district of northern Afghanistan, although the dynasty later claimed descent from the old Sāsānid emperors of Persia. Sāmān-Khudā embraced Islam, and his four grandsons served the caliph al-Maʾmūn in Khurasan. For their faithful service, Nūh was appointed governor of Samarqand, Aḥmad of Farghāna, Yaḥyā of Shāsh, and Ilyās of Herat. They thereby acquired a good foothold in Transoxania, so that in 263/875 Naṣr b. Aḥmad received from the caliph, al-Muʿtamid, the governorship of the whole of that province. This rich region became the core of the Sāmānids' empire, and they took over also the duties of defending Transoxania's political integrity and its commercial interests from attack by the pagan Turks of the steppes. The northern fringes of Transoxania and Farghāna were definitely secured for Islam, and in 280/893 Ismāʿīl b. Aḥmad attacked the Qarluq in the steppes beyond the Syr Darya, sacking their capital Talas. By

making their military might feared in the steppes and by keeping the caravan routes across Central Asia open, the Sāmānids assured the economic stability of their territories; it was through the Sāmānid lands that most of the Turkish slaves, almost universally employed in the armies of Muslim princes from the ninth century onwards, were imported. On this foundation of prosperity, the Sāmānid amīrs made their court of Bukhārā a centre not only of the traditional Arabic learning, but also of the renaissance of New Persian language and literature; it was under Sāmānid rule that Firdausī began his version of the Iranian national epic, the *Shāh-nāma*.

In 287/900 Ismā'īl earned the gratitude of the 'Abbāsid caliph by defeating and capturing the Ṣaffārid 'Amr b. Layth, and was rewarded with the governorship of Khurasan in succession to the Ṭāhirids and Ṣaffārids. The Sāmānids were now the greatest power in the Iranian east, exercising suzerainty over outlying regions like Khwārazm and over the Ṣaffārids in Sīstān, and extending their authority over local dynasties in Afghanistan as far as the borders of India. In northern Persia, they clashed with the Būyids; here, caliphal and Sunnī support was useful, for the Sāmānids were strong Sunnīs, and in Khurasan and Transoxania they ruled over regions which were strongholds of orthodoxy.

In the middle years of the tenth century, ominous signs of instability appeared in the Sāmānid state. A series of palace revolutions showed that the military and landed classes, opposed to the amīrs' policy of administrative centralisation, were gaining control; rebellions in Khurasan abstracted that province from the direct authority of Bukhārā. It was not therefore difficult for the Qarakhanids and Ghaznavids to take over the Sāmānid territories in the last decade of the century, and the last fugitive Sāmānid, Ismā'īl al-Muntaṣir, was killed in 395/1005.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Lane Poole, 131-3; Justi, 440; Zambaur, 202-3.

W. Barthold, *Turkestan down to the Mongol invasion*[2] (London 1928).

⟨43⟩
The Ṣaffārids
253-c. 900/867-c. 1495
Sīstān

253/867 Ya'qūb b. Layth aṣ-Ṣaffār
265/879 'Amr b. Layth
288/901 Ṭāhir b. Muḥammad b. 'Amr
296/908 Layth b. 'Alī
298/910 Muḥammad b. 'Alī
298/911 first Sāmānid occupation, and usurpations of Kuthayyir b. Aḥmad and Aḥmad b. Qudām
299/912 'Amr b. Ya'qūb b. Muḥammad b. 'Amr
300/913 second Sāmānid occupation
310/922 Aḥmad b. Muḥammad b. Khalaf b. Layth b. 'Alī (originally appointed governor for the Sāmānids)
352/963 Walī-ad-Dawla Khalaf b. Aḥmad
393/1003 Ghaznavid occupation
? Ṭāhir b. Khalaf, governor under Ghaznavid suzerainty in the early part of Maḥmūd of Ghazna's reign
420/1029 Naṣr b. Aḥmad, under Ghaznavid suzerainty in the reigns of Mas'ūd and Mawdūd, then after 440/1048 under Seljuq suzerainty
465/1073 Bahā'-ad-Dawla Ṭāhir b. Naṣr
482/1090 Bahā'-ad-Dawla Khalaf b. Naṣr
after 496/1103 Taj-ad-Dīn Naṣr b. ? Khalaf
559/1164 Shams-ad-Dīn Aḥmad or Muḥammad
562/1167 Tāj-ad-Dīn Ḥarb
612/1215 Shams-ad-Dīn Bahrām Shāh
618/1221 Tāj-ad-Dīn Naṣr
618/1221 Mongol invasion: subsequent Ṣaffārids under Mongol suzerainty
618/1221 Rukn-ad-Dīn Abū-Manṣūr
619/1222 Shihāb-ad-Dīn Maḥmūd
622/1225 'Alī
626/1229 Shams-ad-Dīn 'Alī

652/1254	Naṣr-ad-Dīn
728/1328	Nuṣrat-ad-Dīn
731/1331	Quṭb-ad-Dīn Muḥammad
747/1346	Tāj-ad-Dīn I
751/1350	Maḥmūd
763/1362	'Izz-ad-Dīn
784/1382	Quṭb-ad-Dīn I
788/1386	Tāj-ad-Dīn II
805/1403	Quṭb-ad-Dīn II
822/1419	Shams-ad-Dīn
842/1438	Niẓām-ad-Dīn Yaḥyā
885-?/1480-?	Shams-ad-Dīn Muḥammad

The Ṣaffārid brothers derived their name from their founder Ya'qūb's trade of coppersmith (*ṣaffār*). Under Ya'qūb and 'Amr, their native province of Sīstān became the centre of a vast but transient empire which covered almost all Persia except for the north-west. Sīstān in the ninth century was much disturbed by sectarian strife and social discontent; it had been a refuge-area for various malcontents and schismatics fleeing eastwards through Persia, especially for the Khārijīs, defeated and dispersed by the Umayyad governors. It may be that Ya'qūb had originally been a Khārijī himself; the nucleus of his army lay in the bands of local vigilantes formed to defend the cause of Sunnī orthodoxy in Sīstān, but his troops came to include many Khārijīs. Having assembled this army, Ya'qūb expanded eastwards through Afghanistan to Kabul, then a pagan region on the fringe of the Indian world, overturning native rulers there. In the west, he attacked the Ṭāhirids, wresting from them their lands in Khurasan and in 259/873 capturing their capital Nishapur. Whereas the Ṭāhirids and Sāmānids represented the interests of religious orthodoxy and the social *status quo*, the Ṣaffārid chiefs were plebeian in origin and behaved like bandits, whilst their forces included many heterodox and radical elements. With the defensive barrier of the Ṭāhirids swept away, the 'Abbāsid caliph in Baghdad had no alternative but to recognise 'Amr as his governor in Sīstān, Khurasan and Fārs. Not content with these extensive territories, 'Amr coveted Transoxania, which had been nominally under Ṭāhirid oversight. But the actual holders of power in Transoxania, the Sāmānids,

proved more than a match for the Ṣaffārids, and the amīr Ismā'īl b. Aḥmad defeated and captured 'Amr. Being the personal creation of military conquerors, the Ṣaffārid empire now collapsed, and in the early years of the tenth century Sīstān passed under Sāmānid control.

Despite this severe check, the Ṣaffārid family persisted in Sīstān for nearly six more centuries, and it is clear that they represented the national interests and aspirations of the people of Sīstān, from whose ranks they themselves had sprung. It is difficult otherwise to explain the tenacity with which the Ṣaffārids survived successive waves of conquest in Sīstān. The yoke of the Sāmānids was light enough, and the Ṣaffārids soon re-appeared as governors and local rulers; one of the tenth century amīrs, Khalaf b. Aḥmad, attained fame as a munificent patron of learning. In 393/1003 Maḥmūd of Ghazna overran the province and incorporated it in his empire, an event which the patriotic author of the *Ta'rīkh-i Sīstān* (see below) regards as a disaster for the land. Yet once more, the Ṣaffārids held on, and in the Ghaznavid-Seljuq fighting of the middle years of the eleventh century, strengthened their position, ruling first as Seljuq and then as Ghūrid vassals. Even after the invasions of the Mongols and of Tīmūr, events so cataclysmic for most of the eastern Islamic world, they managed to survive down to the end of the fifteenth century.

Zambaur in his lists distinguishes four separate dynasties of the Ṣaffārids in Sīstān, the dividing lines between them being the Sāmānid, Ghaznavid and Mongol occupations, but this division is an arbitrary one, since the same Ṣaffārid family continued to rule on and off during the whole period. The list given here differs in several places from that of Zambaur, and takes into account the numismatic corrections of Walker, and the historical information of the anonymous local history, the *Ta'rīkh-i Sīstān*, not available for earlier writers on the chronology of the Ṣaffārids. For the post-Mongol Saffārids, Zambaur depended on the list (which does in fact tally with the available numismatic evidence) given in another local history of Sīstān, the *Iḥyā' al-mulūk* of Shāh Ḥusayn b. Malik Ghiyāth-ad-Dīn Muḥammad; this list is reproduced in Codrington's article (see below).

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

Lane Poole, 129-30 (ignores all but the very first Ṣaffārids).

Justi, 439; Sachau, 11-12; Zambaur, 199-201.

O. Codrington, 'Further note on Musulman coins collected by Mr G. P. Tate in Seistan', JRAS (1905), 547-53.

Ta'rikh-i Sīstān, ed. Malik ash-Shu'arā' Bahār (Tehran 1314, 1935).

J. Walker, *The coinage of the second Saffarid dynasty in Sistan* (American Numismatic Society, Numismatic Notes and Monographs, No. 72, New York 1936).

⟨44⟩
The Khwārazm-Shāhs

1. Afrīghids of Kāth (AD 305-385/995)

. . . . .

?-385/?-995 Abū-ʿAbdallāh Muḥammad
Ma'mūnid conquest

2. Ma'mūnids of Gurgānj (385-408/995-1017)

c. 382/c. 992 Abū-ʿAlī Ma'mūn I
387/997 Abū-l-Ḥasan ʿAlī
399/1009 Abū-l-ʿAbbās Ma'mūn II
407-8/1017 Abū-l-Ḥārith Muḥammad
Ghaznavid conquest

3. Ghaznavid governors (408-25/1017-34)

408/1017 Altuntash
423/1032 Hārūn b. Altuntash (lieutenant of the nominal Khwārazm-Shāh, Saʿīd b. Masʿūd of Ghazna, later independent of Ghazna)
425/1034 Ismāʿīl Khāndān b. Altuntash (independent of Ghazna)
432/1041 conquest of Khwārazm by the Oghuz Yabghu, Shāh Malik of Jand

4. Line of Anūshtigin (c. 470-628/c. 1077-1231, originally as governors for the Seljuqs, latterly as independent rulers in Central Asia and Persia

c. 470/c. 1077 Anūshtigin Gharcha'ı
490/1097 Turkish governor Ekinchi b. Qochqur
490/1097 Quṭb-ad-Dīn Muḥammad
521/1127 ʿAlā'-ad-Dīn Atsïz
551/1156 Il-Arslan
567/1172 ʿAlā'-ad-Dīn Tekish
567-89/1172-93 Sulṭān Shāh b. Il-Arslan, rival ruler in northern Khurasan
596/1200 ʿAlā'-ad-Dīn Muḥammad

617-28/1220-31 Jalāl-ad-Dīn Mingburnu (? The exact form of this Turkish name, especially the second component, is uncertain)
Mongol conquest

Khwārazm was the well-irrigated, rich agricultural region on the lower Oxus, in later times the Khanate of Khiva. Surrounded as it was on all sides by steppeland and desert, it was isolated geographically, and this isolation long enabled it to maintain a separate political existence and a distinctive Iranian culture. Khwārazm may well have been an early home of the Indo-Iranians; certainly, the local historian and antiquary Bīrūnī traced the beginnings of political life there beyond the first millennium BC. He placed the beginning of the Iranian Afrīghid dynasty in c. AD 305, and listed twenty-two Shāhs of that line, down to its extinction in 385/995. Khwārazm first came into the purview of Islamic history in 93/712, when the Arab governor of Khurasan, Qutayba b. Muslim, invaded Khwārazm and wrought considerable destruction to the indigenous civilisation. It thus came under Muslim suzerainty, but it was not until the end of the eighth or the beginning of the ninth century that a Khwārazm-Shāh was first converted to the new faith, assuming the traditional convert's name of 'Abdallāh.

In the course of the tenth century, the city of Gurgānj on the left bank of the Oxus grew in economic and political importance, largely because of its position as the terminus for the caravan trade across the steppes to Siberia and South Russia. A local family, the Ma'mūnids, in 385/995 overthrew the Afrīghids of Kāth (which lay on the right bank of the river), and themselves assumed the traditional title of Khwārazm-Shāhs. The rule of the Ma'mūnids was brief, but was not without its achievements; great scholars like the philosopher Ibn-Sīnā (Avicenna) and the littérateur Tha'ālibī flourished under their patronage. Khwārazm had been theoretically under Sāmānid suzerainty, although this had meant little in practice; but in 408/1017, Maḥmūd of Ghazna, heir to Sāmānid power in Khurasan, resolved to add Khwārazm to his empire, and Ma'mūnid rule was ended there. For some twenty years, the province was ruled by Turkish slave governors of the Ghazna-

vids, and then fell into the hands of Shāh Malik b. ʿAlī, the Oghuz Turkish Yabghu or ruler of Jand at the mouth of the Syr Darya. But almost immediately, Shāh Malik was overthrown by his Seljuq rivals (432/1041) and Khwārazm now passed into Seljuq control.

The Seljuq sultans appointed their own governors, and in Malik-Shāh's reign the governor was the Turkish slave, Anūshtigin Gharcha'ī, who had been keeper of the royal washing-bowls (*Ṭasht-dār*). His successors became hereditary governors and acquired the title of Khwārazm-Shāhs. Anūshtigin's grandson Atsïz, whilst remaining nominally a vassal of the Seljuqs, had the ambition of making himself independent of them. This was not difficult to achieve after Sanjar's disastrous defeat of 535/1141 at the hands of the Qara Khitay, but the Shāhs were in turn forced to acknowledge the power of these new invaders from the Far East. In practice, the Qara Khitay left the Shāhs largely to themselves, and the last decades of the twelfth century were taken up with a great struggle for hegemony in Khurasan and the whole of the Iranian east between the Shāhs and the Ghūrids of Fīrūzkūh and Ghazna. In the opening years of the thirteenth century the Shāhs were triumphant, and found themselves masters of an empire stretching from the borders of India to those of Anatolia, for they had meanwhile cleared away the last remnants of Seljuq rule in western Persia and had marched against the ʿAbbāsid caliphs in Baghdad. However, this impressive achievement was transitory; in 617/1220 Chingiz Khan's Mongols conquered Transoxania, and the reign of the last Khwārazm-Shāh, Jalāl-ad-Dīn, was spent in heroic but futile attempts to stem the Mongol inrush into the Middle East.

In subsequent centuries, Khwārazm came under the rule of various central Asian steppe peoples and its original Iranian character was completely overlaid, although the title of Khwārazm-Shāh seems to have been borne by the governors for the Tīmūrids as late as the fifteenth century.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Lane Poole, 176-8 (gives only the Shāhs of Anūshtigin's line).
Justi, 428; Sachau, 12 (on the Ma'mūnids); Zambaur, 208-9.

E. Sachau, 'Zur Geschichte und Chronologie von Khwârazm', SBWAW, Phil.-Hist. Cl., LXXIII (1873), 471-506, LXXIV (1873), 285-330 (includes a list of the Afrīghid Shāhs as given by Bīrūnī).
W. Barthold, *Turkestan down to the Mongol invasion*[2].
M. Nāẓim, *The life and times of Sulṭān Maḥmūd of Ghazna* (Cambridge 1931).
C. E. Bosworth, in *Cambridge History of Iran*, v (forthcoming) (on the descendants of Anūshtigin).

<45>

The Qarakhanids
382-607/992-1211
Transoxania and eastern Turkestan

1. Great Qaghans of the united kingdom

?	ʿAlī b. Mūsā
388/998	Aḥmad I Arslan Qara Khan or Toghan Khan
406/1015	Manṣūr Arslan Khan
415/1024	Aḥmad II Toghan Khan
417-24/1026-32	Yūsuf I Qadīr Khan

2. Great Qaghans of the western kingdom (Transoxania, including Bukhārā and Samarqand and western Farghāna)

433/1041	Muḥammad ʿAyn-ad-Dawla
444/1052	Ibrāhīm I Böritigin Tamghach Khan
460/1068	Naṣr I
472/1080	Khiḍr
?473/?1081	Aḥmad I
482/1089	Yaʿqūb
488/1095	Masʿūd I
490/1097	Sulaymān
490/1097	Maḥmūd I
492/1099	Jibrāʾīl
495/1102	Muḥammad II
?523/?1129	Naṣr II
?523/?1129	Aḥmad II
524/1130	Ḥasan
?526/?1132	Ibrāhīm II
526/1132	Maḥmūd II (later, ruler of Khurasan after the Seljuq Sanjar)
536/1141	Ibrāhīm III
551/1156	ʿAlī
556/1161	Masʿūd II
574/1178	Ibrāhīm IV (before 574/1178 in Farghāna only, thereafter in Samarqand also)
600-7/1204-11	ʿUthmān
	Occupation of Transoxania by the Khwārazm-Shāhs

3. Great Qaghans of the eastern kingdom (Talas, Isfījāb, Shāsh, Semirechye, Kāshghar and usually eastern Farghāna)

423/1032	Sulaymān
448/1056	Muḥammad I
449/1057	Ibrāhīm I
451/1059	Maḥmūd
467/1074	ʿUmar
467/1075	Ḥasan or Hārūn
496/1103	Aḥmad or Hārūn
522/1128	Ibrāhīm II
553/1158	Muḥammad II
?	Yūsuf II
607/1211	Muḥammad III
	Occupation by Küchlüg

The Qarakhanids were given this name by European orientalists because of the frequency of the word *qara* 'black > powerful' in their titulature; they have also been called the Ilek (properly Ilig) Khans, again from a characteristic title, or *Āl-i Afrāsiyāb* 'House of Afrāsiyāb' because of a fancied connection with the prince of Tūrān in Firdausī's *Shāh-nāma*. Our foremost authority on the dynasty, Omelian Pritsak, has asserted that the Qarakhanid dynasty sprang from the ruling house of the Qarluq Turkish people, a group which had played an important rôle in earlier steppe history; the affiliation is not entirely proven, but seems likely.

The Qarakhanids became Muslim in the middle years of the tenth century, and their head Satuq Bughra Khan assumed the Islamic name of ʿAbd-al-Karīm. His grandson Hārūn or Ḥasan Bughra Khan was attracted southwards by the vacuum of power caused by the decline of the Sāmānids of Transoxania; in 382/992 he occupied Bukhārā, and a few years later, he and Maḥmūd of Ghazna finally extinguished the authority of the Sāmānids. The Oxus became the boundary between the two empires, and for the next two centuries the territories of the Qarakhanids stretched from Bukhārā and the lower Syr Darya in the west to Semirechye and Kashgharia in the east. Already in 407/1016 there is mentioned internecine warfare amongst members of the Qarakhanid family, and after c.433/c.1041 the

unified Khanate split into two parts, a western Khanate centred on Bukhārā and comprising Transoxania and western Farghāna as far as Khojand, and an eastern Khanate comprising Talas, Isfījāb, Shāsh, eastern Farghāna, Semirechye and Kashgharia, with Balāṣāghūn as its political and military capital but with Kāshghar as its religious and cultural centre. In general, the descendants of the Great Qaghan 'Alī b. Mūsā (the 'Alid branch, in Pritsak's terminology) ruled in the west, and those of his cousin Hārūn or Ḥasan Bughra Khan (the Ḥasanids) in the east. Towards the end of the eleventh century, there was a crisis in Bukhārā when the Qaghan Aḥmad I b. Khiḍr is said to have embraced Isma'īlī Shī'ism; the Seljuqs had intervened before in Malik-Shāh's reign, and the Qarakhanids now passed definitely under Seljuq suzerainty. But after Sanjar's disastrous defeat in the Qaṭwān steppe in 536/1141, control over the whole of Turkestan north of the Oxus passed to the pagan Qara Khitay or Western Liao from northern China. The last Qarakhanids managed to throw off Qara Khitay control, but the last western Qaghan, 'Uthmān of Samarqand, was in 607/1211 killed by the Khwārazm-Shāh 'Alā'-ad-Dīn Muḥammad, and the eastern Khanate was for a brief while occupied by the Mongol Küchlüg.

Whereas the Turkish Ghaznavids built up a strongly centralised state on the Perso-Islamic pattern, the Qarakhanids remained much closer to their tribal and steppe past. It is from the Qarakhanid period that two of the earliest works of written Turkish stem, the *Qutadghu bilig* of Yūsuf Khāṣṣ Ḥājib and the *Dīwān lughāt at-Turk* of Maḥmūd Kāshgharī. The Qarakhanid territories were organised in a loose tribal confederation, with the greater part of the Qarluq tribesmen remaining nomadic. The ruling family became highly fragmented, since there prevailed a system, common to other Altaic peoples, of a Great Qaghan with a Co-Qaghan at his side; beneath these were Under-Qaghans. Since members of the family were continually moving up in the hierarchy and acquiring new names and titles, the task of elucidating the genealogy and chronology of the Qarakhanids is an exceedingly difficult task. Zambaur noted that this was 'the only major Islamic dynasty whose genealogy has remained obscure' and confessed that the genealogy given by himself (pp. 206-7) was only a sketch. The table given above

follows that worked out by Pritsak from his exten
searches on the dynasty.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. O. Pritsak, 'Karachanidische Str
1-4', *Oriens*, III (1950), 209-28.
idem, 'Die Karachaniden', *Der Islam*, XXXI (1954),
İA, Art. 'Karahanlılar'.

SIX

SELJUQS AND ATABEGS

⟨46⟩

The Seljuqs

429-590/1038-1194

1. Great Seljuqs (Iraq and Persia) 429-590/1038-1194

429/1038	Rukn-ad-Dunyā-wa-d-Dīn Toghrïl I (Ṭughril)
455/1063	ʿAḍud-ad-Dawla Alp-Arslan
465/1072	Jalāl-ad-Dawla Malik-Shāh I
485/1092	Nāṣir-ad-Dīn Maḥmūd I
487/1094	Rukn-ad-Dīn Berk-yaruq (Barkiyāruq)
498/1105	Muʿizz-ad-Dīn Malik-Shāh II
498/1105	Ghiyāth-ad-Dīn Muḥammad I
511-52/1118-57	Muʿizz-ad-Dīn Sanjar (ruler in eastern Persia 490-552/1097-1157; after 511/1118 supreme Sultan of the Seljuq family)

In Iraq and western Persia only:

511/1118	Mughīth-ad-Dīn Maḥmūd II
525/1131	Ghiyāth-ad-Dīn Dā'ūd
526/1132	Rukn-ad-Dīn Toghrïl II
529/1134	Ghiyāth-ad-Dīn Masʿūd
547/1152	Muʿīn-ad-Dīn Malik-Shāh III
548/1153	Rukn-ad-Dīn Muḥammad II
555/1160	Ghiyāth-ad-Dīn Sulaymān Shāh
556/1161	Muʿizz-ad-Dīn Arslan
571-90/1176-94	Rukn-ad-Dīn Toghrïl III
	Khwārazm-Shāhs

2. Seljuqs of Syria 471-511/1078-1117

471/1078	Tāj-ad-Dawla Tutush
488-507/1095-1113	Riḍwān (in Aleppo)
488-497/1095-1104	Duqāq (in Damascus), succeeded by his Atabeg Tughtigin
507/1113	Alp-Arslan al-Akhras } in Aleppo
508-11/1114-17	Sulṭān Shāh } in Aleppo
	Line of Tughtigin, the Börids or Būrids, in Damascus; the Artuqid Il Ghāzī in Aleppo

3. Seljuqs of Kirmān 433-582/1041-1186

433/1041	'Imād-ad-Dīn Qāwurd
465/1073	Kirmān Shāh
467/1074	Ḥusayn
467/1074	Rukn-ad-Dawla Sulṭān Shāh
477/1085	Muḥyī-d-Dīn Tūrān Shāh I
490/1097	Bahā'-ad-Dīn Irān Shāh
495/1101	Muḥyī-d-Dīn Arslan Shāh I
537/1142	Mughīth-ad-Dīn Muḥammad I
551/1156	Muḥyī-d-Dīn Toghrïl Shāh
565/1170	Bahrām Shāh
570/1175	Arslan Shāh II
572/1176	Tūrān Shāh II
579-82/1183-6	Muḥammad II
	Ghuzz occupation

The Seljuqs were originally a family of chiefs in the Qïnïq clan of the Oghuz Turkish people, whose home was in the steppes north of the Caspian and Aral Seas. Becoming Muslims towards the end of the tenth century, they entered the Islamic world in Khwārazm and Transoxania in the same fashion as so many incoming barbarian peoples, *sc.* as auxiliary troops in the service of warring powers there. Deflected into Khurasan, the Seljuqs and their bands of nomadic followers took over that province from the Ghaznavids, and in 429/1038 Toghrïl proclaimed himself sultan at Nishapur. Toghrïl began deliberately to associate his authority with the cause of Sunnī orthodoxy and the freeing of the 'Abbāsid caliphs from the Shī'ī Būyids' tutelage; this

policy helped him to enlist orthodox sympathy as the Seljuqs advanced against the Daylamī powers of western Persia. In 447/1055 Toghrïl entered Baghdad and had his title of sultan confirmed by the caliph; a few years later, the line of the Būyids was finally extinguished.

The Seljuq sultanate now speedily evolved into a hierarchically-organised state on the Perso-Islamic pattern, with the supreme sultan supported by a Persian bureaucracy and a multi-national army directed by Turkish slave commanders, this military nucleus being supplemented by tribal contingents under Turkmen begs or chiefs. In the reigns of Alp-Arslan and his son Malik-Shāh, who both depended to a great extent on their supremely able Persian minister, Niẓām-al-Mulk, the empire of the Great Seljuqs reached its apogee. In the east, Khwārazm and western Afghanistan had already been wrested from the Ghaznavids, and towards the end of his reign Malik Shāh invaded Transoxania and humbled the Qarakhanids, receiving at Uzkend the homage of the Khan of Kāshghar. In the west, the offensive was taken against the Christian Georgians in the Caucasus; Fāṭimid influence was excluded from Syria and al-Jazīra, minor Shīʿī-tinged dynasties like the ʿUqaylids overthrown and reliable Turkish governors installed in Syria. In Anatolia, the defeat of the Byzantines at Malāzgird (Mantzikert) in 463/1071 opened up Asia Minor to Turkmen incursions, and these raiders laid the foundations of various Turkish principalities there. Malik-Shāh's brother Tutush and the latter's sons and grandsons founded a short-lived minor Seljuq line in Aleppo and Damascus. Seljuq arms even penetrated into the Arabian peninsula as far as the Yemen and Baḥrayn. In Kirmān, Toghrïl's nephew Qāwurd established a local dynasty which endured for a century and a half until Oghuz tribesmen from Khurasan took over the province in 582/1186. On the intellectual plane, the efforts of the vizier Niẓām-al-Mulk and scholars like the theologian al-Ghazālī consolidated the defeat of Shīʿism on the political level and strengthened the orthodox Sunnī reaction.

Centrifugal tendencies were always likely to appear in an empire where there still prevailed old Turkish patrimonial ideas about the division of territories amongst various members of the dynasty, once firm control from the centre was relaxed.

After Malik-Shāh's death, the Seljuqs of Iraq and Persia were rocked by dissension and civil strife, although an element of stability was perpetuated in Khurasan, where Malik-Shāh's son Sanjar was first governor and then sultan for over sixty years; after the death in 511/1118 of his brother Muḥammad, Sanjar was acknowledged as the senior member of the family and as supreme sultan. In Iraq, Seljuq power was adversely affected by the revived political influence of the 'Abbāsid caliphs, and in Persia, al-Jazīra and Syria the rise of local Atabegs reduced the sultans' sphere of action. These Atabegs play an important rôle in the history of the Islamic Near East at this time. They were Turkish slave commanders who were in the first place appointed as tutor-guardians (*Atabeg* = 'father-commander') to Seljuq princes sent out as provincial governors; but in many cases they soon managed to arrogate effective power to themselves (see below, s.v. Zangids, Eldigüzids, Salghurids). The problem of assimilating the nomadic, less cultured Turkmens into the settled Seljuq state was never properly solved, and Khurasan slipped from Seljuq control when Sanjar's reign ended disastrously in an uprising of Oghuz tribesmen whose interests had been neglected by the central administration. The last Seljuq sultan in the west, Toghrïl b. Arslan, struggled to free himself from Eldigüzid control, but unwisely provoked a war with the powerful Khwārazm-Shāh Tekish, and was killed in 590/1194. Only in Anatolia did a Seljuq line survive for a further century (see below, s.v. Seljuqs of Rūm).

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Lane Poole, 149-54; Justi, 452-3.
Zambaur, 221-2 and Table R;
EI[1] 'Seldjuḳs' (M. T. Houtsma).
Cahen, 'The Turkish invasion: the Selchükids', in *A history of the Crusades*, ed. K. M. Setton and M. W. Baldwin, I *The first hundred years* (Philadelphia 1955), 135-76.
Bosworth, in *Cambridge history of Iran*, v.

⟨47⟩

The Artuqids
495-811/1102-1408
Diyārbakr

1. Ḥiṣn Kayfā and Āmid branch 491-629/1098-1232

491/1098	Muʿīn-ad-Dīn Sökmen I
498/1105	Ibrāhīm
c. 502/c. 1109	Rukn-ad-Dawla Dāʾūd
539/1144	Fakhr-ad-Dīn Qara Arslan
562/1167	Nūr-ad-Dīn Muḥammad
581/1185	Quṭb-ad-Dīn Sökmen II
597/1201	Nāṣir-ad-Dīn Maḥmūd
619/1222	Rukn-ad-Dīn Maudūd
629/1232	al-Malik al-Masʿūd
	Ayyūbid conquest

2. Mārdīn and Mayyāfāriqīn branch 497-811/1104-1408

497/1104	Najm-ad-Dīn Il Ghāzī I
516/1122	Ḥusām-ad-Dīn Temür Tash
547/1152	Najm-ad-Dīn Alpī
572/1176	Quṭb-ad-Dīn Il Ghāzī II
580/1184	Ḥusām-ad-Dīn Yülük Arslan
c. 597/c. 1201	Nāṣir-ad-Dīn Artuq Arslan
637/1239	Najm-ad-Dīn Ghāzī I
658/1260	Qara Arslan al-Muẓaffar
691/1292	Shams-ad-Dīn Dāʾūd
693/1294	Najm-ad-Dīn Ghāzī II
712/1312	ʿImād-ad-Dīn ʿAlī Alpī
712/1312	Shams-ad-Dīn Ṣāliḥ
765/1364	Aḥmad al-Manṣūr
769/1368	Maḥmūd aṣ-Ṣāliḥ
769/1368	Dāʾūd al-Muẓaffar
778/1376	Majd-ad-Dīn ʿIsā aẓ-Ẓāhir
809-11/1406-8	aṣ-Ṣāliḥ
	Qara Qoyunlu conquest

The Artuqids of Diyārbakr were the descendants of Artuq b. Ekseb, a chief of the Döger tribe of the Oghuz. He is first heard of fighting against the Byzantines in Anatolia, and then we find

the Seljuq sultan, Malik-Shāh, sending him, like other Turkmen begs, to fight on the peripheries of the empire–in Baḥrayn, Syria, and Khurasan. He ended up as governor of Palestine, but his sons were unable to maintain themselves there against the Fāṭimids and Crusaders, and settled instead in Diyārbakr, around Mardīn and Ḥiṣn Kayfā. Gradually, Il Ghāzī b. Artuq took over the Seljuq territories in that region; he was an energetic opponent of the Franks in Edessa, and in 515/1121 also acquired Mayyāfāriqīn. There were henceforth two main branches of the dynasty, the descendants of Il Ghāzī in Mārdīn and Mayyāfāriqīn, and the descendants of his brother Sökmen in Ḥiṣn Kayfā and later Āmid, with a subordinate branch at Khartpert or Kharput.

Being a Turkmen dynasty in a region strongly settled by Turkmens, the Artuqid state retained many distinctively Turkmen features; cf. the appearance of the typical Turkmen ghāzī designation *Alp/Alpī* 'warrior, hero', in their titulature. However, as well as relying on the Turkmen elements, the Artuqids seem also to have conciliated the numerous Christians among the population of Diyārbakr. The rise of the Zangids halted the Artuqids' expansionist plans, and they had to become vassals of Nūr-ad-Dīn. Then the Ayyūbids whittled their power down, and they lost Ḥiṣn Kayfā, Āmid and Mayyāfāriqīn to them. In the thirteenth century, they were for a time vassals of the Rūm Seljuqs and of the Khwārazm-Shāh Jalāl-ad-Dīn Mingburnu; and eventually, only the Mārdīn branch survived, Qara Arslan al-Muẓaffar submitting to the Mongol Khan Hülegü. The end of the dynasty a century and a half later was connected with the fresh wave of Turkmen nomads brought in the wake of the Tīmūrid invasions. The last Artuqids were enveloped by the Qara Qoyunlu confederation, and in 811/1408 aṣ-Ṣāliḥ was forced to abandon Mārdīn to the Qara Qoyunlu leader Qara Yūsuf.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Lane Poole, 166-9; Zambaur, 228-30.
İA, 'Artuk Oğullari' (M. F. Köprülü).
EI² 'Artuḳids' (Cl. Cahen).

⟨48⟩
The Zangids
521–619/1127–1222
al-Jazīra and Syria

1. Principal line in Mosul and Aleppo

521/1127	ʿImād-ad-Dīn Zangī b. Aq Sonqur
541/1146	Sayf-ad-Dīn Ghāzī I
544/1149	Quṭb-ad-Dīn Mawdūd
564/1169	Sayf-ad-Dīn Ghāzī II
572/1176	ʿIzz-ad-Dīn Masʿūd I
589/1193	Nūr-ad-Dīn Arslan Shāh I
607/1211	ʿIzz-ad-Dīn Masʿūd II
615/1218	Nūr-ad-Dīn Arslan Shāh II
616–19/1219–22	Nāṣir-ad-Dīn Maḥmūd
	Power seized by the Vizier Badr-ad-Dīn Luʾluʾ

2. Line in Damascus and then Aleppo

541/1146	Nūr-ad-Dīn Maḥmūd b. Zangī
569–77/1174–81	Nūr-ad-Dīn Ismāʿīl
	United again with Mosul, then conquered by Saladin

Zangī was the son of Aq Sonqur, who was a Turkish ghulām commander of the Seljuq Malik-Shah and governor of Aleppo from 479/1086 to 487/1094 (the origin of the name Zangī is unclear: an obvious meaning would be 'black African', possibly relating to a swarthy complexion, but the word could be Turkish). In 521/1127 Sultan Maḥmūd appointed Zangī governor of Mosul and Atabeg or guardian of his two sons. The unsettled conditions within the Seljuq sultanate of the west, and the general appearance of other semi-independent Atabeg principalities, facilitated the rise of the Zangids. From his base in Mosul, Zangī was well-placed for expansion westwards through al-Jazīra into Syria and northwards into Kurdistan. At various times he defied the Seljuq sultan and clashed with the local Arab and Turkmen amirs. He also fought the Byzantines and Franks, and his capture of Edessa in 539/1144 from Count Jocelyn II made him the hero of the Sunnī world.

When Zangī died, his dominions were divided between his sons Nūr-ad-Dīn Maḥmūd, who took over Zangī's Syrian conquests, and Sayf-ad-Dīn Ghāzī I in al-Jazīra. Later, a third branch of the family ruled separately in Sinjār for some fifty years. Nūr-ad-Dīn's policy in Syria and Palestine against the Franks and declining Fāṭimids paved the way for Saladin's career and for the constituting of the Ayyūbid empire. The Syrian branch of the Zangids was later absorbed by the Mosul one, and the Zangids then inevitably came up against the Ayyūbids, with their expansionist policy in Diyārbakr and al-Jazīra. Saladin twice failed to capture Mosul in 578/1182 and 581/1185 but Mas'ūd I b. Mawdūd was compelled to make terms and recognise the Ayyūbid as his suzerain.

The end of the Zangids came with the ascendancy in Mosul of Badr-ad-Dīn Lu'lu', the former slave of Arslan Shāh I, who after that ruler's death became regent for the kingdom. When the last Zangid Nāṣir-ad-Dīn Maḥmūd died, Lu'lu' became Atabeg of Mosul with the title of al-Malik ar-Raḥīm, and reigned there till his death in 657/1259, shortly before the Mongols took over.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Lane Poole, 162-4; Justi, 461.
Zambaur, 226-7.
H. A. R. Gibb, 'Zengi and the fall of Edessa' and 'The career of Nūr-ad-Dīn', in *A history of the Crusades*, ed. K. M. Setton and M. W. Baldwin, I *The first hundred years*, 449-62, 513-27.

⟨49⟩
The Eldigüzids or Ildegizids
531-622/1137-1225
Azerbayjan

531/1137	Shams-ad-Dīn Eldigüz
570/1175	Nuṣrat-ad-Dīn Pahlavān Muḥammad
581/1186	Muẓaffar-ad-Dīn Qīzīl Arslan 'Uthmān
587/1191	Qutlugh Inanj
591/1195	Nuṣrat-ad-Dīn Abū-Bakr (from 581/1186 as subordinate ruler in Azerbayjan)
607-22/1210-25	Özbeg
	Conquest by Khwārazm-Shāhs

The Eldigüzids or Ildegizids were an Atabeg dynasty who controlled north-western Persia, including most of Azerbayjan, Arrān, and northern Jibāl, during the second half of the twelfth century when the Seljuq sultanate of western Persia and Iraq was in full decay and unable to prevent the growth of virtually independent provincial powers.

Eldigüz was originally the Turkish military slave of the Seljuq Vizier Simirumī, and then passed to Sultan Mas'ūd b. Muḥammad, who made him governor of Arrān. A skilful marriage to the widow of Sultan Toghrïl II b. Muḥammad enabled him to champion the succession in 556/1161 of her son Arslan, and during Arslan's sultanate, the Eldigüzids were the real power behind the throne. Their territories stretched as far south as Iṣfahān, and in the north, to the borders of Sharvān and Georgia. Sultan Toghrïl III b. Arslan was for many years held in close tutelage by the Eldigüzids, who at one point claimed the sultanate for themselves, until in 587/1191 he turned the tables on Qutlugh Inanj b. Pahlavān Muḥammad and was able to pursue an independent policy for the last three years of his life.

The Eldigüzids did not survive beyond the first quarter of the thirteenth century. They continued for a while to rule in Azerbayjan, and managed to overthrow their ancient rivals, the Atabeg dynasty of Aḥmadīlīs of Marāgha, but in 622/1225 the Khwārazm-Shāh Jalāl-ad-Dīn Mingburnu finally deposed

Özbeg b. Pahlavān Muḥammad. The historical significance of the family thus lies in their control of north-western Persia during the later decades of the period of the Great Seljuqs, and also in their rôle of Muslim champions against the resurgent power of the Georgian Bagratid rulers.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Lane Poole, 171; Justi, 461.
Zambaur, 231: Bosworth, in *Cambridge history of Iran*, v.

⟨50⟩

The Salghurids

543–668/1148–1270

Fārs

543/1148 Muẓaffar-ad-Dīn Sonqur
556/1161 Muẓaffar-ad-Dīn Zangī
570/1175 Degele (Daklā)
590/1194 Toghrïl
601/1203 'Izz-ad-Dīn Sa'd I
628/1231 Abū-Bakr Qutlugh Khan
658/1260 Sa'd II
658/1260 Muḥammad
660/1262 Muḥammad Shāh
661/1263 Seljuq Shāh
663–8/1265–70 Äbish Khātūn
Direct Mongol rule

The Atabeg dynasty of the Salghurids ruled in Fārs for some 120 years as tributaries first of the Seljuqs, and then in the thirteenth century, of the Khwārazm-Shāhs and Mongols. They were of Turkmen origin, and the Salghur or Salur tribe seems to have come westwards at the time of the Seljuq invasions and to have played a significant part in the establishment of the Rūm sultanate. The founder of the Fārs dynasty, Sonqur, took advantage of the warfare and disputes which disturbed the reign of the Seljuq sultan, Mas'ūd b. Muḥammad, to consolidate his position in southern Persia, after Fārs had already for some time been under the control of another Turkish Atabeg, Boz-Aba. With the decline of the Seljuqs, the Salghurids enjoyed an uninterrupted possession of Fārs, campaigning against the local Shabānkāra'ī Kurds and intervening in succession disputes amongst the neighbouring Kirmān Seljuqs.

Fārs enjoyed considerable prosperity under the rule of 'Izz-ad-Dīn Sa'd b. Zangī, although he had latterly to acknowledge the suzerainty of the Khwārazm-Shahs and link his family to them by marriage alliances; it was from this ruler that the Persian writer Sa'dī derived his *nom de plume*, his father having been in Sa'd's service. In the reign of Sa'd's son and successor Abū-Bakr, Fārs came under the suzerainty of the Mongol khans

Ögedey and then Hülegü, and it was from the Mongols that Abū-Bakr acquired the title Qutlugh Khan. Finally, the last Salghurid princess, Qutlugh Khan's granddaughter, married Hülegü's son Mengü Temür, and in the end, the latter took over the Salghurid territories himself.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Lane Poole, 172-3; Justi, 460.
Zambaur, 232; Bosworth, in *Cambridge history of Iran*, v.

⟨51⟩
The Ismā'īlīs or Assassins

483-653/1090-1256, Persia; c. 493-671/c. 1100-1273, Syria
Principal line at Alamūt in the Elburz Mts of Persia; subsidiary branch in Syria

Grand Masters at Alamūt

483/1090	Ḥasan-i Ṣabbāḥ
518/1124	Kiyā Buzurg-Ummīd
532/1138	Muḥammad I
557/1162	Ḥasan II 'Alā-Dhikrihi-s-Salām
561/1166	Nūr-ad-Dīn Muḥammad II
607/1210	Jalāl-ad-Dīn Ḥasan III
618/1221	'Alā'-ad-Dīn Muḥammad III
653-54/1255-6	Rukn-ad-Dīn Khūrshāh
	Mongol capture of Alamūt

In mediaeval Islamic times, the extremist Shī'ī Ismā'īlīs were regarded with fear by the orthodox Sunnīs. Since the Ismā'īlīs appealed to a wide range of intellects and interests, their hand was suspected in many of the outbreaks of social and political discontent. The Nizārī branches in Persia and Syria used the weapon of religious assassination (a practice familiar from ancient times in the East), and launched raids from their mountain fortresses; by these means, an atmosphere of terror was created, so that the numerousness and apparent ubiquity of the assassins were unduly magnified in popular imagination.

The founder of the Ismā'īlī groups in northern Persia and Syria was one Ḥasan-i Ṣabbāḥ, a Persian *dā'ī* who worked to spread the cause in his own land. When the Fāṭimid movement was split doctrinally on al-Mustanṣir's death in 487/1094 (see above, p. 48), the eastern Ismā'īlīs acknowledged Nizār, the elder son and the dead caliph's own choice as heir, although the vizier Badr-al Jamālī succeeded in placing al-Musta'lī on the throne. Already in 483/1090, Ḥasan had secured the castle of Alamūt in the Elburz Mts, in a region adjacent to Daylam and Azerbayjan, where heterodoxy had long flourished. From this centre, Ismā'īlī risings were organised in various parts of the Great Seljuq empire. Another Nizārī *da'wa* was established in the mountains of Syria, under the leadership of emissaries from

Alamūt, and the Syrian Ismāʿīlīs played a significant rôle in a three-cornered struggle with the Franks and the Sunnī Muslims. Since the Ismāʿīlīs were comparatively few in number, assassination of prominent people often served as a substitute for direct military action, and their supposed victims included the vizier Niẓām-al-Mulk, the caliph al-Mustarshid and the crusader Conrad of Montferrat. The story related by Marco Polo and others, that hallucinatory drugs were used to stimulate the assassins to bolder efforts (whence the name 'Assassins' < *Hashīshiyyīn* or *Hashshāshīn* 'Hashish-eaters') is unconfirmed in any of the genuine Ismāʿīlī sources. According to Ismāʿīlī tradition, Nizār and his son were murdered in Egypt, but an infant grandson was smuggled out to Persia. Whereas Ḥasan-i Ṣabbāḥ and his two successors claimed only to be emissaries of the Nizārī imāms, the fourth Grand-Master Ḥasan II himself claimed to be the imām in a spiritual sense.

In the thirteenth century, the extremism and violence of the Assassins began to moderate slightly. The ʿAbbāsid caliph an-Nāṣir scored a great propaganda success in the contemporary Muslim world by securing the Grand Master Ḥasan III's return to the fold of Sunnī orthodoxy. Continuing this pro-caliphal policy, the Ismāʿīlīs of Persia opposed the imperial designs of the Khwārazm-Shāhs. But the last Grand Master, Khūrshāh, was unable to withstand Hülegü's Mongols; Alamūt was captured in 654/1256, and in the next year Khūrshāh seems to have been killed by the conquerors. The Syrian Ismāʿīlīs had become an accepted part of the local political scene, becoming tributary to the Christian Knights Hospitaller in 624/1227, but their continued existence was later regarded by the sultan Baybars as intolerable, and by 671/1273 the last Assassin stronghold, al-Kahf, had fallen to the Mamlūks.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Justi, 457; Sachau, 15; Zambaur, 217-18.

B. Lewis, 'The Ismāʿīlites and the Assassins', in *A history of the Crusades*, ed. K. M. Setton and M. W. Baldwin, I *The first hundred years*, 99-132.

M. G. S. Hodgson, *The order of Assassins, the struggle of the early Nizârî Ismâʿîlîs against the Islamic world* (The Hague 1955).

SEVEN

ANATOLIA AND THE TURKS

⟨52⟩
The Seljuqs of Rūm
470-707/1077-1307
Anatolia

470/1077 Sulaymān b. Qutalmīsh
479/1086 interregnum
485/1092 Qïlïch Arslan I
500/1107 Malik-Shāh
510/1116 Rukn-ad-Dīn Mas'ūd I
551/1156 'Izz-ad-Dīn Qïlïch Arslan II (division of territories amongst his sons during the latter part of his reign)
588/1192 Ghiyāth-ad-Dīn Kay-Khusraw I, *first reign*
592/1196 Rukn-ad-Dīn Sulaymān II
600/1204 'Izz-ad-Dīn Qïlïch Arslan III
601/1204 Ghiyāth-ad-Dīn Kay-Khusraw I, *second reign*
607/1210 'Izz-ad-Dīn Kay-Kā'ūs I
616/1219 'Alā'-ad-Dīn Kay-Qubādh I
634/1237 Ghiyāth-ad-Dīn Kay-Khusraw II
644/1246 'Izz-ad-Dīn Kay-Kā'ūs II
646/1248 Kay-Kā'us II and his brother Rukn-ad-Dīn Qïlïch Arslan IV jointly
647/1249 Kay Kā'ūs II, Qïlïch Arslan IV and 'Alā'-ad-Dīn Kay-Qubādh II jointly
655/1257 Qïlïch Arslan IV
663/1265 Ghiyāth-ad-Dīn Kay-Khusraw III
681/1282 Ghiyāth-ad-Dīn Mas'ūd II, *first reign*

683/1284	'Alā'-ad-Dīn Kay-Qubādh III, *first reign*
683/1284	Mas'ūd II, *second reign*
692/1293	Kay-Qubādh III, *second reign*
693/1294	Mas'ūd II, *third reign*
700/1301	Kay-Qubādh III, *third reign*
702/1303	Mas'ūd II, *fourth reign*
704/1305	Kay-Qubādh III, *fourth reign*
707/1307	Ghiyāth-ad-Dīn Mas'ūd III
	Mongol occupation

After the Seljuq chief Qutalmīsh had unsuccessfully rebelled against Sultan Alp-Arslan in 456/1064, his son Sulaymān and his Turkmen followers were deflected from the settled lands of Persia and Iraq into Anatolia, where there were ample opportunities for warfare with the Byzantines. In about the year 470/1077 Sulaymān was master of Iznik (Nicaea), but the emergent Comneni dynasty, later aided by the First Crusaders, began to re-establish their position in western Anatolia, and Sulaymān turned eastwards. He endeavoured to get a foothold in the Antioch-Aleppo region, but was killed in 479/1086 by the troops of Sultan Malik-Shāh. It was only some years later that Berk-yaruq released Sulaymān's son Qïlïch Arslan I and allowed him to go back to Anatolia. Qïlïch Arslan had ambitions in Diyārbakr and al-Jazīra, but he was killed fighting there, and after this, his successors concentrated their power on central Anatolia. From this base they attacked the Danishmendids, the Armenian princes of Cilicia and the Franks of Edessa. Qïlïch Arslan II overthrew the Dānishmendids, and his defeat of Manuel Comnenus at Myriocephalon in 572/1176 quashed Byzantine hopes of a revanche in the east, but in his old age he lost control over his sons, his territories became fragmented and in 586/1190 the emperor Frederick Barbarossa and the Third Crusaders temporarily occupied the capital Konya.

The Latin conquest of Constantinople in 1204 afforded the sultans of Rūm an opportunity to re-establish their power. Antalya and Sinope were seized, and the port of Alanya or 'Alā'iyya (thus called after Sultan 'Alā'-ad-Dīn Kay-Qubādh I) was constructed. Because of this control of the coasts, an important transit trade to the Black Sea grew up, and commercial relations were opened up with the Italian city-states. It

is to this period that the architectural and artistic glories of Seljuq Konya belong. However, the dervish rebellion of Baba Is'ḥāq in 638/1240 was a sign of internal discontent, and when the Mongols invaded Anatolia, the Seljuqs were defeated at Kösedagh (641/1243). The sultanate retained its independence, but had to pay a huge tribute to the Mongols, and squabbles amongst the sons of Kay-Khusraw II led to a division of the kingdom. Mongol control grew stricter, especially after the Mamlūk sultan Baybars' expedition into central Anatolia in 675/1276, which brought the Great Khan Abaqa to Anatolia. The names of the Seljuq sultans appear on coins down to 702/1302, but they had no real authority; the last ones seem to have reigned in Sinope and perhaps in Alanya, where Ottoman chronicles mention a Seljuq descendant in the fifteenth century (cf. Sachau, 16).

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Lane Poole, 155; Justi, 452-3.
Zambaur, 143-4; Halil Edhem, 216-17, 219.
EI[1] 'Seldjuks' (J. H. Kramers).

<53>

The Dānishmendids

c. 464-573/c. 1071-1177
Central and eastern Anatolia

1. Sivas branch c. 464-570/c. 1071-1174

c. 464/c. 1071	Malik Dānishmend Ghāzī
477/1084	Amīr Ghāzī Gümüshtigin
529/1134	Malik Muḥammad
536/1142	Malik ʿImād-ad-Dīn Dhū-n-Nūn, *first reign* (in Kayseri)
537/1142	Malik Niẓām-ad-Dīn Yaghī-basan
560/1164	Malik Mujāhid Jamāl-ad-Dīn Ghāzī
562/1166	Malik Shams-ad-Dīn Ibrāhīm
562/1166	Malik Shams-ad-Dīn Ismāʿīl
564-70/1168-74	Malik Dhū-n-Nūn, *second reign* (now with the honorific title Nāṣir-ad-Dīn)
	Seljuqs of Rūm

2. Malatya branch c. 537-573/c. 1142-78

c. 537/c. 1142	ʿAyn-ad-Dīn b. Gümüshtigin
547/1152	Dhū-l-Qarnayn
557/1162	Nāṣir-ad-Dīn Muḥammad, *first reign*
565/1170	Fakhr-ad-Dīn Qāsim
567/1172	Afrīdūn
570-3/1175-8	Nāṣir-ad-Dīn Muḥammad, *second reign*
	Seljuqs of Rūm

The centre of power of this Turkmen dynasty was originally in northern Anatolia around Tokat, Amasya, and Sivas. The founder Dānishmend appeared in Anatolia as a ghāzī or fighter for the faith during the confusion following the Seljuq Sulaymān b. Qutalmïsh's death, and soon afterwards, the Dānishmendids seem to have clashed with the First Crusaders. Dānishmend is the centre of an epic legend tradition, which was not written down for nearly two centuries, and in this epic he is made to connect with the earlier Muslim frontier warrior Sayyid Baṭṭāl; in elucidating Dānishmendid origins, it is accordingly difficult to disentangle fact from fiction. In the early twelfth century, Amīr Ghāzī Gümüshtigin intervened in the

succession disputes of the Rūm Seljuqs, fought the Armenians in Cilicia and the Franks in the County of Edessa, and in 521/1127 captured Kayseri and Ankara; because of his warfare with the Christians, the caliph al-Mustarshid granted the Dānishmendids the title of *Malik* 'King'.

But when Malik Muḥammad died in 536/1142, disputes arose amongst his sons and brothers: Yaghī-basan proclaimed himself Amīr at Sivas, his brother 'Ayn-ad-Dīn succeeded in Elbistan and Malatya, and Dhū-n-Nūn seized Kayseri. There were thus for a time three rival branches of the Dānishmendids, but after Yaghī-basan's death, the Seljuq Qïlïch Arslan II interfered several times in the affairs of the Sivas branch, finally killing Dhū-n-Nūn in 570/1174 and seizing his lands. At Malatya, discord existed amongst the three sons of Dhū-l-Qarnayn, and the last ruler here, Nāṣir-ad-Dīn Muḥammad, reigned as Qïlïch Arslan II's vassal till the latter took over Malatya himself in 573/1178; according to the historian Ibn-Bībī, the surviving Dānishmendids entered the service of the Seljuqs.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Lane Poole, 156 (very fragmentary).
Justi, 455; Sachau, 15; Zambaur, 146–7.
Halil Edhem, 220–3; EI² 'Dānishmendids' (I. Mélikoff).
(above table based on these two)
İA 'Dânişmendliler' (M. H. Yinanç) (with a genealogical table).

⟨54⟩
The Qaramānids
c. 654–888/c. 1256–1483
Central Anatolia

c. 654/c. 1256	Qaramān b. Nūra Ṣūfī
660/1261	Muḥammad I
677/1278	Badr-ad-Dīn Maḥmūd
?	Burhān-ad-Dīn Mūsā
?	Fakhr-ad-Dīn Aḥmad
750/1349	Shams-ad-Dīn
753/1352	'Alā'-ad-Dīn Khalīl
783/1381	'Alā'-ad-Dīn b. Khalīl
792–805/1390–1403	*Ottoman occupation*
805/1403	Muḥammad II
822–4/1419–21	*Mamlūk occupation*
824/1421	Muḥammad II (reinstated)
827/1424	'Alā'-ad-Dīn 'Alī
827/1424	Tāj-ad-Dīn Ibrāhīm
868/1463	Is'ḥāq
869/1464	Pīr Aḥmad
874/1479	Pīr Aḥmad and Qāsim jointly
879–88/1474–83	Qāsim
	Ottoman conquest

The Qaramānids were the most powerful and enduring of the Turkish dynasties of Anatolia which grew up alongside the Ottomans but were eventually absorbed by them. It seems that they arose from the Afshār tribe of Turkmens and that the father of Qaramān, Nūra, was a well-known Ṣūfī shaikh; the dynasty would therefore resemble other Anatolian ruling lines in that it sprang from dervish origins. Their original centre was at Ermenek in the north-western Taurus Mts, where they were vassals of the Seljuq Sultan of Konya, Rukn-ad-Dīn Qïlïch Arslan IV. At this time, they also lived uneasily with the Mongols and the Mamlūks, whose suzerainty they at one time acknowledged; but in the fourteenth century they formed a definitely independent state, controlling most of central and southern Anatolia. Their capital of Karaman or Laranda became an important centre of artistic and cultural activity; and

in modern Turkish eyes at least, the Qaramānids have achieved some fame for their encouragement of Turkish instead of Persian as the language of administration.

Inevitably, they clashed with the expanding Ottomans, and in 792/1390 'Alā'-ad-Dīn Khalīl was defeated by Bayezit at Aq Chay, and the Qaramānid territories annexed. But after his defeat of Bayezit at Ankara in 805/1402, Tīmūr restored many of the Anatolian principalities which the Ottomans had swallowed, including that of the Qaramānids. Clashes continued with the Ottomans, for after the absorption of the Isfendiyār Oghullarī of Sinope and Kastamonu in 866/1462, they were the last great rivals of the sultans. The Qaramānids were now drawn into the nexus of Mediterranean powers opposing Ottoman expansionism. The alliance of the 'Grand Caraman' was sought by Venice and the Papacy, and by their eastern neighbours, the Aq Qoyunlu of Uzun Ḥasan, and Qāsim, the last Qaramānid, supported the Ottoman pretender Jem. But internal succession disputes facilitated Ottoman intervention, and the dynasty was shortly afterwards extinguished.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Lane Poole, 184; Zambaur, 158, 160.
Halil Edhem, 296-302 (on which the above table is largely based).
EI[1] 'Ḳaramān-Oghlu' (J. H. Kramers) (with genealogical table differing in several places from Halil Edhem's).
İA 'Karamanlilar' (M. C. Şihâbeddin Tekindağ).

⟨55⟩
The Ottomans or Osmanlīs
680–1342/1281–1924
Anatolia, the Balkans, the Arab lands

680/1281	ʿUthmān (Osman) I b. Ertoghrïl
c. 724/c. 1324	Orkhān
761/1360	Murād I
791/1389	Bāyazīd (Bayezit) I Yïldïrïm ('the Lightning-flash')
804/1402	*Tīmūrid invasion*
805/1403	Muḥammad (Mehmet) I Chelebi (at first in Anatolia only, after 816/1413 in Rumelia also)
806/1403	Sulaymān I (in Rumelia only till 813/1410)
824/1421	Murād II, *first reign*
848/1444	Muḥammad II Fātiḥ ('the Conqueror'), *first reign*
850/1446	Murād II, *second reign*
855/1451	Muḥammad II, *second reign*
886/1481	Bāyazīd II
918/1512	Selīm I Yavuz ('the Grim')
926/1520	Sulaymān II Qānūnī ('the Law-giver', also called in western usage 'the Magnificent')
974/1566	Selīm II
982/1574	Murād III
1003/1595	Muḥammad III
1012/1603	Aḥmad I
1026/1617	Muṣṭafā I, *first reign*
1027/1618	ʿUthmān II
1031/1622	Muṣṭafā I, *second reign*
1032/1623	Murād IV
1049/1640	Ibrāhīm
1058/1648	Muḥammad IV
1099/1687	Sulaymān III
1102/1691	Aḥmad II
1106/1695	Muṣṭafā II
1115/1703	Aḥmad III

1143/1730	Maḥmūd I
1168/1754	'Uthmān III
1171/1757	Muṣṭafā III
1187/1774	'Abd-al-Ḥamīd I
1203/1789	Selīm III
1222/1807	Muṣṭafā IV
1223/1808	Maḥmūd II
1255/1839	'Abd-al-Majīd I
1277/1861	'Abd-al-'Azīz
1293/1876	Murād V
1293/1876	'Abd-al-Ḥamīd II
1327/1909	Muḥammad V Rashād
1336/1918	Muḥammad VI Waḥīd-ad-Dīn
1341-2/1922-4	'Abd-al-Majīd II (as Caliph only)
	Republican régime of Muṣṭafā Kemāl

The beginnings of the Ottomans are shrouded in legend, and few firm historical facts are known before 1300. The family seems to have stemmed from the Qayïgh clan of the Öghuz and to have led a nomadic group in Asia Minor; they were thus part of the great wave of Turkmens who came in from the east and pushed the Byzantines back. The Ottomans had been loosely attached to the Seljuq Sultans of Konya, but the appearance of the Mongols and the decline of the Seljuqs during the thirteenth century impelled them to move to the north-western corner of Anatolia, the ancient province of Bithynia and the later Ottoman vilâyet of Hüdavendigâr. Whilst more settled Turkish principalities were being set up in other parts of Anatolia, such as those of the Qaramānids, the Menteshe Oghullarï and the Germiyān Oghullarï, the Ottomans had to keep up the fight with the Byzantines. Their forces were accordingly continuously replenished by fresh arrivals of Turkmens from the east, eager to act as ghāzīs or warriors for the faith against the Christians, and from these ghāzī origins, the Ottoman dynasty acquired a military tradition and a vigour which allowed it to expand and flourish, and eventually to absorb all the other, more static Turkish principalities.

In 758/1357 The Ottomans crossed into Europe at Gallipoli, and taking advantage of the disunity of the Balkan Slavs and the religious enmities of Orthodox and Catholics, they rapidly

overran a large part of the Balkans; these conquests were eventually formed into the province of Rumelia. Indicative of the Ottomans' new concentration on Europe, rather than Asia, was the removal of their capital from Bursa to Edirne (Adrianople) in 767/1366. Militarily, they came to depend less and less on their Turkmen followers, whose religious sympathies were often heterodox. There arose a feudal cavalry element who were allotted estates to live off, but most important in creating an image in Christian Europe of Ottoman ferocity and invincibility were the Janissaries (*Yeni Cheri*, 'New Troops'), who were recruited from the children of the subject Christian populations of the Balkans, converted to Islam and trained as an élite military force. In 796/1394 Bayezit I secured from the *fainéant* 'Abbāsid Caliph in Cairo, al-Mutawakkil I, the title of Sultan of Rūm, but his Asiatic empire was suddenly shattered by the onslaught of Tīmūr, who defeated the Sultan at Ankara in 805/1402. Over the following decades, the Ottoman empire in Asia Minor was gradually pieced together again, the Qaramānids being the last major group to be absorbed, and in 857/1453 Mehmet the Conqueror finally captured Constantinople.

The sixteenth century was the golden age of the empire. In 923/1517 Selīm the Grim conquered Egypt and Syria from the decadent rule of the Mamlūks; after the victory of Mohacz in 932/1526, Sulaymān the Magnificent brought most of Hungary under Ottoman rule for over a century and a half; footholds were secured in southern Italy, and corsairs brought Ottoman rule to Algeria and Tunisia. On the eastern borders, the Shī'ī Ṣafavids, bitter rivals of the Sunnī Ottomans, were defeated at Chaldirān in 920/1514 and Azerbayjan invaded; in the Indian Ocean, Turkish naval forces operated from Arabian bases against the Portuguese.

At this peak of their strength, the Ottomans maintained an attitude of tolerance towards the millets or religious and ethnic minorities within their empire, and Jews, for instance, resorted thither from persecution in Christian Europe. It was only towards the end of the seventeenth century that the tide began to turn definitely against the Turks in eastern Europe. They had failed to take much advantage of the European powers' preoccupation with the Thirty Years' War, and their only major

success was the capture of Crete from the Venetians. Yet the Turks were only just repulsed from Vienna in 1094/1683, and the loss of Hungary and Transylvania still left them in control of the Slav, Greek, and Rumanian parts of the Balkans. European divisions and jealousies preserved the Ottoman empire for two more centuries, for the Europeans' technical skill had by now given them a clear military and naval superiority. The undisciplined Janissaries had long been a barrier to modernisation of the Turkish forces, but it was not until 1241/1826 that Maḥmūd II broke their power. Economically, the Turkish and Arab lands began to suffer from the competition of western manufactured goods and superior commercial techniques; native production declined, internal sources of revenue decreased and in the nineteenth century Turkey frequently tottered on the edge of bankruptcy.

Russian expansionism was an especial threat, for the Russians subdued the Ottomans' allies the Crimean Tartars and were eager to get control of Istanbul and the Bosphorus, thus acquiring access to the Mediterranean. In the opening years of the nineteenth century, the Albanian soldier Muḥammad 'Alī became governor and virtually autonomous ruler of Egypt; the Greeks revolted and by 1829 had their independence recognised; and Algeria was lost to the French. The growth of nationalist sentiment engendered by the French Revolution led the Balkan peoples to rebel against Turkish rule, and by the end of the Second Balkan War of 1912-13, Turkey in Europe was reduced to Eastern Thrace. Turkey's participation in the First World War on the side of the Central Powers caused the loss of the Arab provinces, and tempted the European powers to make claims on what was genuinely ethnic Turkish territory. But the greed of these powers provoked a reaction of Turkish national feeling, one aspect of which was a weariness with the Ottoman dynasty itself, which seemed to be a bar to progress and which was inextricably identified with the reverses and humiliations of the previous two centuries. Under the stimulus of the nationalist leader Muṣṭafā Kemāl (the later Atatürk), first the Ottoman sultanate was abolished in 1922, and then in 1924 the caliphate was ended and the last Ottoman, 'Abd-al-Majīd II, deposed.

BIBLIOGRAPHY
Lane Poole, 186-97.
Zambaur, 160-1 and Table 0; Halil Edhem, 320-30.
A. D. Alderson, *The Structure of the Ottoman dynasty* (Oxford 1956).

EIGHT

THE MONGOLS

The Mongols or Chingizids

The recorded history of the Mongols begins only at the end of the twelfth and the beginning of the thirteenth centuries, for it is only with the thirteenth-century *Secret history of the Mongols* and some Persian and Chinese sources of that time that any historical records become available. It seems, however, that the Mongols were originally a forest people, inhabiting the Siberian and Outer Mongolian forest fringes around Lake Baikal, rather than steppe nomads, even though it is as steppe conquerors, moving swiftly on horseback, that they first appear in history.

Chinggis' father Yesügey was Khan of the Mongol tribe. Chinggis originally had the name Temüjin (='blacksmith'), and he rose to prominence in Mongolia through the patronage of a chief of the Kereyt tribe, Toghrïl or Ong Khan (the Prester John of Marco Polo). Later, Temüjin quarrelled with Ong Khan, and defeated in battle first the latter and then a Mongol rival, Jamuqa. He had already acquired the title of Chinggis (? < Turkish *tengiz* 'sea' ='Oceanic, Universal [Khan]'), and at a *Quriltay* or assembly of Mongol chiefs in 1206 was proclaimed Supreme Chief of all the Mongol peoples. He now undertook campaigns against the Tibetan Tanguts of the Kansu and Ordos regions of north-western China, and in 1213 invaded China proper, sacking Peking in 1215 and undermining the position of the Chin emperors. An invasion of Semirechye in northern Turkestan in 1218 gave Chinggis a common frontier with the territories of the Islamic Khwārazm-Shāhs. There had already been peaceful diplomatic contacts, but the Utrār incident of 615/1218, when the Khwārazmian governor there massacred Chinggis' envoys and a whole caravan of Muslim

merchants accompanying them, precipitated the Mongol invasion of the Islamic world. In 616-17/1219-20 Transoxania was conquered; Chinggis' son Toluy was sent into Khurasan, and after a momentary reverse at Parwān in Afghanistan, the last Khwārazm-Shāh Jalāl-ad-Dīn was pursued into India (618/1221). Meanwhile, two other sons, Jochi and Chaghatay, were operating in the region of the lower Syr Darya and Khwārazm, destroying the homeland of the Shāhs; for the last years of his life, Jalāl-ad-Dīn was a fugitive, fleeing ever westwards before the Mongols.

It was the custom of Mongol chiefs to distribute sections of their territories to other members of their families, and this Chinggis had done before his death in 624/1227, allotting each of them a stretch of pasture ground (a *yurt* or *nuntuq*) for their followers and herds. The territories overrun by the Mongols were too vast to be ruled as a centralised state, and the Mongols themselves were politically and administratively quite unsophisticated; the Mongol language was not at this time a written one. Hence a bureaucracy had to be hastily improvised for the conquered lands, if only to collect taxation for the khans. The official classes of these lands, Uyghur, Persian and, Chinese, were drawn upon, and the Buddhist Uyghur secretaries, the *bakhshis*, were especially noteworthy. It is from two Persians in the Mongol service, 'Aṭā' Malik Juwaynī and Rashīd-ad-Dīn Faḍlallāh, that much of our knowledge of the early Mongols and their history comes.

Chinggis' lands were accordingly divided between his four sons in the following way:

(1) The eldest, Jochi, in fact died just before his father, but his inheritance was passed on to his own son Batu. Jochi's allocation had been of western Siberia and the Qïpchaq steppe, extending into southern Russia and including also Khwārazm, which had always been linked culturally and commercially with the lower Volga. His son Batu founded the Blue Horde in South Russia, nucleus of the later Golden Horde, and another son Orda founded the White Horde in western Siberia, these two groups being united in the fourteenth century. At a later date, various khanates in Russia, Siberia and Turkestan evolved from them, including those of the Crimea, of Astrakhan, of Qazan, of Qasimov, of Tiumen, of Bukhārā and of Khīva. In

the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries the descendants of another of Jochi's sons, Shība̅n, *sc.* the Shaybānids or Özbegs, made themselves masters of Khwārazm and Transoxania.

(2) The second son Chaghatay was given the lands stretching eastwards from Transoxania to eastern or Chinese Turkestan. The western branch of Chaghatay's descendants in Transoxania soon came within the Islamic sphere of influence, but was overthrown by Tīmūr; the eastern branch in Semirechye and the Ili basin and across the T'ien Shan in the Tarim basin, was more resistant to Islam. However, the eastern descendants of Chaghatay eventually helped to spread Islam in Chinese Turkestan, and they lasted there till the seventeenth century.

(3) The third son Ögedey was chosen by a *Quriltay* of Mongol chiefs to succeed his father as Great Khan, but within two generations the Supreme Khanate fell into the hands of the descendants of Toluy, although Ögedey's grandson Qaydu retained his territories in the Pamirs and T'ien Shan and combatted the Chaghatayids and the Great Khan Qubilay, till his death in 702/1301.

(4) The youngest son Toluy had received the heartland of the Mongol empire, Mongolia itself. His sons Möngke and Qubilay followed Ögedey's line as Great Khans, but only Möngke retained Qaraqorum in Mongolia as his capital. Their possessions included the Chinese conquests, where the Mongols became known as the Yüan dynasty and reigned till the second half of the fourteenth century. The cultural and religious attraction of the civilisation of China proved strong for the Great Khans in Peking; they became Buddhists, and their adhesion to this faith gradually opened up a breach with the Mongol subordinate khans in western Asia and Russia, who adopted Islam. It was one of Qubilay's brothers, Hülegü, who launched a fresh wave of conquest upon the Islamic world and founded the Il-Khanid line in Persia; thus the khanates of western Asia ceased, for all practical purposes, to acknowledge the control of the Great Khans back in Mongolia and in Peking.

‹56›
The Mongol Great Khans, descendants of Ögedey and Toluy (Yüan dynasty of China) 603-1043/1206-1634
Mongolia and northern China

603/1206	Chinggis (Chingiz) Khan
624/1227	Ögedey
639/1241	Töregene, as Regent
644/1246	Güyük
647/1249	Oghul-Ghaymish, as Regent
649/1251	Möngke (Mengü)
658/1260	Qubilay
693/1294	Temür Öljeytü (Ūljāytū)
706/1307	Qayshan Gülük
710/1311	Ayurparibhadra Buyantu
720/1320	Suddhipala Gege'en (Gegen)
723/1323	Yesün Temür
728/1328	Arigaba
728/1328	Jijaghatu Toq-Temür
729/1329	Qushila Qutuqtu
732/1332	Rinchendpal (Irinjipal)
732-71/1332-70	Toghan Temür
	The line of Toluy's descendants continued in Mongolia alone till the seventeenth century, but the Khans in China were replaced in 1368 by the Ming dynasty

Ögedey's reign was marked by the completion of the conquest of northern China, *sc.* the Chin empire, and the annexation of Korea; it was not until 1279 that the Sung empire in southern China was overthrown. At the other end of the Old World, Batu was raiding the South Russian steppes and central Europe, terrorising mediaeval Christendom (see below pp. 153-4). Although Ögedey's son Güyük had numerous offspring, the supreme khanate passed on Güyük's death in 647/1249 to another line, that of Möngke and the descendants of Toluy. When Möngke's brother Qubilay was proclaimed Great Khan by a *Quriltay* in China, the descendants of Ögedey broke out in

revolt, and under Qaydu and Chapar were for a long time an embarrassment to the Great Khans. They eventually submitted to the family of Toluy, but in later times, various members of the house of Ögedey were raised to power in periods of revolution and unrest, and the great Tīmūr set up two of these in Transoxania, Soyurghatmīsh and his son Maḥmūd, to replace the Chaghatayids there.

The Great Khans in Qaraqorum and after Möngke's time, in Peking or Khan-balïq (='City of the Khans'), led a life of a certain barbarian splendour, as the accounts of travellers and visitors from western Europe and the Near East show. The material wealth and plunder gained from the Mongol conquests was concentrated on the capitals; artisans and craftsmen were gathered there; and scholars, writers, and religious leaders made their way to the khans' encampment. The Mongols displayed the traditional tolerance of the steppes, and were willing to give a hearing to the arguments of Latin and Nestorian Christians, Muslims, Buddhists, and Confucianists. Inevitably, the original animistic shamanism of the Mongols gave way in Mongolia and northern China to one of the higher religions, in fact to Buddhism in the Tibetan Lamaist form. This became and has remained the dominant religion of the Mongols of eastern Asia, and was even carried westwards to the Volga and Kuban by the Oyrot Mongols or Kalmucks in their great migration of the early seventeenth century.

The Mongol Great Khans gradually settled down to being yet another Chinese dynasty of barbarian origin, called in Chinese the Yüan. They ruled in China till in 1368 they were replaced by the Ming, but well before then they had ceased to have much influence over the Mongol khanates of central and western Asia. Only in Mongolia proper did the descendants of the Great Khans survive with some independence, though under the general suzerainty of the Ming emperors.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Lane Poole, 201-16; Zambaur, 241-3.
L. Hambis, *Le chapitre CVII du Yuan Che, les généalogies impériales mongoles dans l'histoire chinoise officielle de la dynastie mongole* (=Supplement to *T'oung Pao*, XXXVIII) (Leiden 1945) (Tables based on both Chinese and Persian sources).
F. W. Cleaves, 'The Mongol names and terms in the *History of*

the Nation of the Archers by Grigor of Akanc", HJAS, XII, (1949), 400-43.
J. A. Boyle, 'On the titles given in Juvainī to certain Mongol princes', HJAS, XIX (1956), 146-54.
EI^2 'Čingiz-Khān' (Boyle).

⟨57⟩
The Chaghatayids, descendants of Chaghatay
624-771/1227-1370
Transoxania, Semirechye and eastern Turkestan

624/1227	Chaghatay
639/1241	Qara Hülegü, *first reign*
645/1247	Yesü Möngke
650/1252	Qara Hülegü, *second reign*
650/1252	Orqīna Khatun
659/1261	Alughu
664/1266	Mubārak Shāh
664/1266	Baraq
c. 670/c. 1271	Negübey (Nīkpāy)
670/1272	Tuqa Temür
c. 690/c. 1291	Duwa
706/1306	Könchek
708/1308	Taliqu
709/1309	Kebek (Köpek), *first reign*
709/1309	Esen Buqa
c. 718/c. 1318	Kebek, *second reign*
726/1326	Eljigidey
726/1326	Duwa Temür
726/1326	'Alā' ad-Dīn Tarmashīrīn
734/1334	Changshi
735/1334	Buzan
c. 739/c. 1338	Yesün Temür
c. 743/c. 1342	Muḥammad
744/1343	Qazan
747/1346	Dānishmendji
749/1348	Bayan Quli
760/1359	Shāh Temür

760 - 71 / 1359 - 70 Tughluq Temür
Tīmūrid conquest

After Chinggis' death, Chaghatay had great prestige as the eldest surviving son and as being an acknowledged expert on the Mongol tribal law, the *Yasa*; he was, indeed, strongly anti-Muslim and insisted on enforcing those prescriptions of the *Yasa* which ran counter to the Muslim *Sharī'a*, e.g. over the slaughtering of animals for meat and over ablutions in running water. Chaghatay's *Yurt* straddled the T'ien Shan Mts on both sides, but the Chaghatay khanate was not really founded till after Chaghatay's own death. His sons and grandsons quarrelled amongst themselves and conspired against the Great Khan Möngke, and according to William of Rubruck, the North German friar who travelled to the Mongol court in Qaraqorum, the whole Mongol empire was divided c. 1250 between Möngke and Batu. The real founder of the Chaghatay khanate was Chaghatay's grandson Alughu, who took advantage of the civil war between Möngke's sons Qubilay and Arïq Böke to seize Khwārazm, western Turkestan and Afghanistan, nominally for Arïq Böke but in fact for himself; these territories became the nucleus of the khanate.

The Chaghatayids were less directly under the influence of Islam than the Mongols in Persia, the Il-Khanids, and preserved their nomadic and tribal ways much longer; these facts probably contributed to the general decline of urban life and agriculture in central Asia outside the oases of Transoxania and eastern Turkestan. Mubārak Shāh (666/1266) was the first Chaghatayid definitely to adopt Islam, but from 690/1291 onwards, Duwa and his descendants were fiercely pagan and resided in the eastern territories straddling the T'ien Shan. Kebek was the first to return to Transoxania, where he built a palace at Nakhshab or Qarshi. Tarmashīrīn (whose name in this Persianised form enshrines a Buddhist one like *Dharmaśīla* 'Having the habit of the Dharma or Buddhist law') became a Muslim, but the strongly anti-Islamic nomadic Mongols of the eastern part of the khanate rose against him and killed him (734/1334). The unity of the Chaghatayids began to disintegrate soon after this, as Tīmūr rose to power in Transoxania. Various Chaghatayids were placed on the throne in Trans-

oxania, and then some descendants of Ögedey. The Chaghatayid family managed to survive, and after Tīmūr's death its fortunes revived in Transoxania under Esen Buqa II (833-67/1429-62), a dangerous enemy of the later Tīmūrids; but its Transoxanian territories eventually fell to the Shaybānids. Only the eastern branch persisted in Semirechye and in the Tarim basin, where it expanded towards Turfan and shared power in Kāshghar with the Dughlat tribe of Turks until the final extinction of the Chaghatayids in the later seventeenth century.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Lane Poole, 241-2; Zambaur, 248-50.
Hambis, *Le chapitre CVII du Yuan Che.*
EI[2] 'Čaghatay Khān', 'Čaghatay Khānate' (Barthold-Boyle).

⟨58⟩
The Il-Khanids, descendants of Qubilay's brother Hülegü
654-754/1256-1353
Persia

654/1256 Hülegü (Hūlāgū)
663/1265 Abaqa
680/1282 Aḥmad Tegüder (Takūdār)
683/1284 Arghun
690/1291 Gaykhatu
694/1295 Baydu
694/1295 Maḥmūd Ghazan
703/1304 Muḥammad Khudābanda Öljeytü (Uljāytū)
717/1317 Abū-Sa'īd
736/1335 Arpa
736/1336 Mūsā
736-54/1336-53 period of several rival khans nominated by the Jalāyirid Amīr Ḥasan Buzurg and the Chūpānī Amīr Ḥasan Küchük; thereafter Persia divided amongst local dynasties such as the Jalāyirids, Muẓaffarids and Sarbadārids of Khurasan

The Great Khan Möngke entrusted his brother Hülegü with the task of recovering and consolidating the Mongol conquests in western Asia, for in the interval since Chinggis' death, direct control of much of the Islamic world south of the Oxus had slipped from the Mongols' hands. Hülegü accordingly came westwards. He overcame the resistance of the Ismā'īlīs or Assassins of northern Persia (654/1256); routed a caliphal army in Iraq and murdered the last 'Abbāsid of Baghdad, al-Musta'ṣim (656/1258); and advanced into Syria, where, however, the Mongols were defeated and halted by the Mamlūks of Egypt at 'Ayn-Jālūt in Palestine (658/1260). Hülegü now became ruler on behalf of the Great Khan of all the region of Persia, Iraq, the Caucasus and Anatolia, and assumed the title of *Il-Khan*, *sc.* subject or subordinate of the Great Khan.

The Il-Khanid kingdom was now definitely constituted, but

it had many external enemies, including the Mamlūks, who had now destroyed the popular belief in Mongol invincibility. The other Mongol houses of the Golden Horde and the Chaghatayids were also hostile over disputed territories in the Caucasus and northeastern Iran respectively. It was common hostility towards the Il-Khanids that brought about the political and commercial alliance of the Mamlūks and the Golden Horde, whereas the Il-Khanids for their part tried to make an anti-Muslim alliance with the European Christian powers, with the Crusaders of the Levant coast towns and with the Armenians of Cilicia. Hülegü's wife Doquz Khatun was a Nestorian Christian, and the early Il-Khanids were definitely favourable towards Christianity and Buddhism.

The Il-Khanids managed to hold their own against external foes, but after Qubilay's death in 693/1294, links with the Great Khans in China became very loose, especially as the cultural and religious pressures of the Persian environment brought about the conversion to Islam of Ghazan Khan and his successors. Abū-Sa'īd was the last great Il-Khanid. He made peace with the Mamlūks in 723/1323 and thus ended the fighting over Syria, but his kingdom was racked by internal strife and it was unfortunate that he died without legitimate heir. The years after his death were accordingly filled with a succession of ephemeral khans, raised to the throne by the rival Jalāyirid and Chūpānī Amīrs, until finally the Il-Khanid empire fell to pieces and was replaced by local dynasties. It was left to Tīmūr to reunite the Persian lands under one sovereign.

Despite much warfare and internal stress, the Il-Khanid period was a prosperous one for Persia. With the conversion of Ghazan, a reconciliatory process between the Mongol-Turkish ruling class and their Persian subjects began. The Il-Khanid capitals of Tabrīz and Marāgha became great centres of learning, with the natural sciences and historical writing especially favoured. After 707/1307 Öljeytu planned a new capital at Sulṭāniyya near Qazwīn; artists and architects were encouraged, and a distinctive style of Il-Khanid architecture emerged. The internationalist attitudes of the Mongols, their connections with such differing cultures as those of Christian Europe and China, brought fresh intellectual, commercial and artistic influences into the Persian world; for instance, colonies of Italian

traders now appeared in the capital Tabrīz, and the Il-Khanid empire played a significant connecting rôle in trade with the Far East and India.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Lane Poole 217-21; Zambaur, 244-5.
Hambis, *Le chapitre CVII du Yuan Che.*
B. Spuler, *Die Mongolen in Iran, Politik, Verwaltung und Kultur der Ilchanzeit 1220-1350*[2] (Berlin 1955), with a genealogical table at p. 533.

⟨59⟩

The Khans of the Golden Horde, descendants of Jochi

623-907/1226-1502

South Russia and western Siberia

1. Line of Batu'ids, khans of the Blue Horde in South Russia and western Qïpchaq

624/1227	Batu b. Jochi
653/1255	Sartaq
654/1256	Ulaghchi
655/1257	Berke (Baraka)
665/1267	Möngke (Mengü) Temür
679/1280	Töde Möngke (Mengü)
686/1287	Töle Buqa
689/1290	Ghiyāth-ad-Dīn Toqtu
712/1312	Ghiyāth-ad-Dīn Muḥammad Özbeg
742/1341	Tīnī Beg
742/1341	Jānī Beg (Jambek)
758-82/1357-80	*period of anarchy, with the claimants Muḥammad Berdi Beg, Qulpa and Nawrūz Beg Muḥammad*

2. Line of Orda, khans of the White Horde in Siberia and eastern Qïpchaq, and after 780/1378, of the Blue and White Hordes united into the Golden Horde of South Russia

623/1226	Orda b. Jochi
679/1280	Köchü
701/1302	Bayan
708/1309	Sāsibuqa (? Sarïgh Buqa)
c. 715/c. 1315	Ilbasan
720/1320	Mubārak Khwāja
745/1344	Chimtay
762/1361	Urus
777/1375	Tuqtaqiya
777/1375	Temür Malik
778/1376	Ghiyāth-ad-Dīn Toqtamïsh
797/1395	Temür Qutlugh
803/1401	Shādī Beg

810/1407	Pūlād	
813/1410	Temür	
815/1412	Jalāl-ad-Dīn	
815/1412	Karīm Berdi	
817/1414	Kebek	
820/1417	Jabbār Berdi	
822/1419	Ulugh Muḥammad, *first reign*	rival khans
823/1420	Dawlat Berdi	rival khans
825/1422	Baraq	rival khans
832/1427	Ulugh Muḥammad, *second reign* (later in Qazan)	
c. 838/c. 1433	Sayyid Aḥmad I	
c. 840/c. 1435	Küchük Muḥammad	
871/1465	Aḥmad	
886/1481	Shaykh Aḥmad	co-rulers
886/1481	Sayyid Aḥmad II	co-rulers
886/1481	Murtaḍā	co-rulers
	Defeat of Shaykh Aḥmad by the Giray khans of the Crimea in 907/1502 and absorption of the remnants of the Golden Horde into the Crimean Tatar Horde	

Chinggis' eldest son Jochi had been allotted as his *Yurt* western Siberia and the Qïpchaq Steppe, and on his death in 624/1227, the eastern part of his appanage, *sc.* western Siberia, fell to his eldest son Orda, who became titular head of the descendants of Jochi and founded in his territories the White Horde. Little is known about the early White Horde khans, but the forceful and energetic Toqtamïsh (d. 809/1406) is a figure of major importance. He united the Batu'id Blue Horde (by now known as the Golden Horde) with the White Horde, and once more made the Golden Horde a power of importance in Russia, sacking Nizhniy Novgorod and Moscow in 784/1382. However, he had the misfortune to come up against Tīmūr, who drove him out of his capital Saray on the Volga, and Toqtamïsh was forced to flee to exile with Vitold of Lithuania.

The western half of Jochi's appanage, Khwārazm and the Qïpchaq Steppe of South Russia, went to his second son Batu. Batu ravaged Russia almost as far as Novgorod, captured Kiev and attacked Poland and Hungary. Christian Europe was only

saved from further molestation after Batu's army's Liegnitz victory of 638/1241 and the pursuit of Béla IV to the shores of the Adriatic, by the news of the Great Khan Ögedey's death. Based on the capital Saray, Batu's Blue Horde became the nucleus of the Golden Horde (a name apparently given to them by the Russians, *Zolotaya Orda*). From Özbeg onwards (d. 742/1341), the khans of the Golden Horde were all Muslims, and this meant that there was a religious gulf fixed between the ruling Horde and the mass of their Christian Russian subjects, although Latin Christian missionaries continued to work for some time in the Qïpchaq Steppe. The Horde had important commercial links with Anatolia and the Mamlūk empire in Syria and Egypt; slave replenishments were sent to the Mamlūks, whilst the culture of the Horde received a definite Islāmic-Mediterranean impress, in contrast to the Persianised Il-Khanids. However, the growth of the Ottoman power and their control of the Dardanelles after 755/1354 cut them off from the Mediterranean and contact with the Mamlūks and henceforth made them a purely Russian power.

Real power in the Golden Horde was held after Toqtamïsh's death by the capable 'Mayor of the Palace', Edigü, but after the latter's death in 822/1419, a process of disintegration, with much internal discord, began. Already in the later fourteenth century the rise of Poland-Lithuania and the Princedom of Muscovy had seriously checked the authority of the khans, and the Ottomans and their allies the Crimean Tatars were also hostile. It was, indeed, the Crimean khan, Mengli Giray, who in 907/1502 finally overthrew the Golden Horde. But before this date, other khanates had split off from the Golden Horde, under various descendants of a third son of Jochi, Toqa Temür: these included the khanates of Astrakhan (till the Russian conquest of 961/1554), of Qazan (till the Russian conquest of 959/1552), of Qasimov (around Ryazan, to the southeast of Moscow, till c. 1092/c. 1681, the last khans becoming Christians), and of the Crimea.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Lane Poole, 222-31.
Zambaur, 244, 246-7 and Table s.

B. Spuler, *Die Goldene Horde, die Mongolen in Russland 1223-1502* (Leipzig 1943), with genealogical tables and lists at pp. 453-4.

EI[2] 'Djuči' (Boyle), 'Batu' (Barthold-Boyle), 'Batu'ids' (Spuler.)

⟨60⟩
The Shaybānids, descendants of Jochi
905-1007/1500-98
Transoxania

832-73/1429-68	Abū-l-Khayr (ruler in Khwārazm)
905/1500	Muḥammad Shaybānī (conqueror of Transoxania)
916/1510	Köchkunju
937/1531	Muẓaffar-ad-Dīn Abū-Sa'īd
940/1534	Abū-l-Ghāzī
946/1539	'Abdallāh I
947/1540	'Abd-al-Laṭīf
959/1552	Nawrūz Aḥmad
963/1556	Pīr Muḥammad I
968/1561	Iskandar
991/1583	'Abdallāh II
1006/1598	'Abd-al-Mu'min
1007/1598	Pīr Muḥammad II
	Replaced in Bukhārā by the Jānids, former khans of Astrakhan

When Toqtamīsh and his White Horde moved westwards and united with the Golden Horde in South Russia, western Siberia fell to the descendants of Jochi's youngest son Shïban, who were known as the Shaybānids (from the Arabicised form of Shïban's name). One branch of them remained in Siberia as khans of Tiumen until the seventeenth century, but much of the Shaybānī Horde moved into Transoxania, where they became known as the Özbegs, progenitors of the indigenous inhabitants of the present-day Uzbekistan SSR. In 851/1447 Abū-l-Khayr took over Khwārazm from the Tīmūrids, and in 906/1500 his grandson Muḥammad Shaybānī conquered Trans-

oxania from the last Tīmūrids. During the sixteenth century, the Sunnī Shaybānids carried on fairly continuous warfare with the Shīʿī Ṣafavids of Persia, and their alliance was courted by other Sunnī powers such as the Ottomans and the Mughals of India. The Shaybānids ruled in Bukhārā till 1007/1598, when the Jānids, descendants of Jochi's son Orda and connections of the Shaybānids in the female line, assumed power; Khwārazm, or Khīva, as the Khanate there came to be called, remained under the authority of a collateral branch of the Shaybānids, the ʿArabshāhids, until the end of the eighteenth century.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Lane Poole, 238-40, 270-3; Zambaur, 270-1.

⟨61⟩
The Giray Khans of the Crimea, descendants of Jochi
c. 831–1208/c. 1426–1792

c. 831/c. 1426	Ḥājjī Giray, *first reign*
860/1456	Ḥaydar Giray
860/1456	Ḥājjī, *second reign*
871/1466	Nūr-Dawlat Giray, *first reign*
871/1466	Mengli Giray, *first reign*
879/1474	Nūr-Dawlat, *second reign*
880/1475	Mengli, *second reign*
881/1476	Nūr-Dawlat, *third reign*
883/1478	Mengli, *third reign*
920/1514	Muḥammad Giray I
931/1523	Ghāzī Giray I
932/1524	Sa'ādat Giray I
939/1532	Islām Giray I
939/1532	Ṣāḥib Giray I
958/1551	Dawlat Giray I
985/1577	Muḥammad Giray II
992/1584	Islām Giray II
998/1588	Ghāzī Giray II, *first reign*
1005/1596	Fatḥ Giray I
1006/1596	Ghāzī II, *second reign*
1016/1608	Toqtamīsh Giray
1017/1608	Salāmat Giray I
1019/1610	Muḥammad Giray III, *first reign*
1019/1610	Jānbeg Giray, *first reign*
1032/1623	Muḥammad III, *second reign*
1036/1627	Jānbeg, *second reign*
1044/1635	'Ināyat Giray
1046/1637	Bahādur Giray I
1051/1641	Muḥammad Giray IV
1054/1644	Islām Giray III
1064/1654	Muḥammad IV, *second reign*
1076/1666	'Ādil Giray
1082/1671	Selīm Giray I, *first reign*
1089/1678	Murād Giray
1094/1683	Ḥājjī Giray II
1095/1684	Selīm I, *second reign*

1103/1691 Sa'ādat Giray II
1103/1691 Ṣafā' Giray
1104/1692 Selīm I, *third reign*
1110/1699 Dawlat Giray II, *first reign*
1114/1702 Selīm I, *fourth reign*
1116/1704 Ghāzī Giray III
1119/1707 Qaplan Giray I, *first reign*
1120/1708 Dawlat Giray II, *second reign*
1125/1713 Qaplan I, *second reign*
1128/1716 Dawlat Giray III
1129/1717 Sa'ādat Giray III
1137/1724 Mengli Giray II, *first reign*
1143/1730 Qaplan I, *third reign*
1149/1736 Fatḥ Giray II
1150/1737 Mengli, *second reign*
1152/1740 Salāmat Giray II
1156/1743 Selīm Giray II
1161/1748 Arslan Giray, *first reign*
1169/1756 Ḥalīm Giray
1172/1758 Qīrīm Giray, *first reign*
1178/1764 Selīm Giray III, *first reign*
1180/1767 Arslan, *second reign*
1181/1767 Maqṣūd Giray, *first reign*
1182/1768 Qīrīm, *second reign*
1182/1769 Dawlat Giray IV, *first reign*
1184/1770 Qaplan Giray II
1184/1770 Selīm III, *second reign*
1185/1771 Maqṣūd, *second reign*
1186/1772 Ṣāḥib Giray II
1189/1775 Dawlat IV, *second reign*
1191/1777 Shāhīn Giray, *first reign*
1197/1783 Russian annexation of the Crimea
1198/1784 Bahādur Giray II } as Russian vassals
1199/1785 Shāhīn, *second reign* }

Khans of the Tatars of Bujaq or Bessarabia, as Ottoman nominees:

1203/1787 Shāhbāz Giray
1205-8/1789-92 Bakht Giray

Amongst the descendants of Jochi's son Toqa Temür, one branch established itself in the Crimea during the internecine strife which convulsed the Golden Horde after 760/1359. At first they were vassals of Toqtamīsh, but then in the early fifteenth century they became wholly independent of the Golden Horde under their own khan, Ḥājjī Giray (d. 871/1466). The family name Giray derives possibly from that of the Kerey, a component clan of the Golden Horde which had supported Ḥājjī Giray. The Crimean khanate now became one of the most enduring states to arise from the stock of Chinggis Khan.

The Ottomans were the natural allies of the Girays, at first against the Golden Horde, whose khans regarded the Crimea as subject to themselves, and then from the sixteenth century onwards, against the Russians. The Girays claimed to be heirs to the Golden Horde, and did at times in the sixteenth century rule in Qazan. From the later sixteenth century, the khans ruled from their capital at Baghche Saray (Simferopol) over much of the southern part of the Ukraine and the lower Don-Kuban region, acting as a Muslim buffer-state between the Ottomans on one side and Russia and Poland on the other. Dependence on Istanbul was shown by the requirement of a Giray hostage at the sultans' court; on the other hand, there was a vague feeling that, should the Ottoman dynasty die out, the Girays had a claim to the succession in Turkey.

The eighteenth-century Russian expansionism towards the Black Sea and Mediterranean and the enfeeblement of the Ottomans, spelled the end of Crimean independence, and in 1197/1783 Catherine the Great's troops occupied and annexed the Crimea: one or two of the Girays were, however, subsequently appointed by the Sublime Porte to head the Tatars in Bessarabia.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Lane Poole, 235–7.
Zambaur, 247–8 and Table s.
İA 'Giray' (Halil İnalcik), with a detailed genealogical table, on which the above list is based.

NINE

PERSIA AFTER THE MONGOLS

⟨62⟩
The Muẓaffarids
713-95/1314-93
Southern Persia

713/1314	Mubāriz-ad-Dīn Muḥammad b. al-Muẓaffar
759/1358	Quṭb-ad-Dīn Shāh Maḥmūd (in Isfahān and Abarqūh till 776/1375)
765/1364	Jalāl-ad-Dīn Shāh Shujā' (in Fārs and Kirmān; after 776/1375 in Iṣfahān also)
786/1384	Mujāhid-ad-Dīn Zayn-al-'Ābidīn 'Alī (dethroned by Tīmūr 789/1387)
786-95/1384-93	'Imād-ad-Dīn Aḥmad (in Kirmān)
789-95/1387-93	Nuṣrat-ad-Dīn Yaḥyā (in Yazd)
789-95/1387-93	Manṣūr (in Iṣfahān, Fārs and Iraq)
	Tīmūrid conquest

The founder of the dynasty, Sharaf-ad-Dīn al-Muẓaffar, was in the service of the Mongols, being appointed a 'Commander of a Thousand' (*Amīr-i Hazāra*) by Ghazan Khan and governor of a town near Iṣfahān. His son Muḥammad was also governor of Yazd, and in the chaos in the Il-Khanid empire following Abū-Sa'īd's death in 736/1336, expanded his possessions in Fārs after protracted struggles against the Injū'id Abū-Is'ḥāq. A marriage to the daughter of the last Qutlugh-Khanid ruler of Kirmān brought that province to him. By 758/1356 he was undisputed master of Fārs and Iraq, and was tempted into

invading Azerbayjan, where he captured Tabrīz, but was unable to hold on to it.

Muḥammad was deposed by his own son Shāh Shujā' (who followed Abū-Is'ḥāq Injū'ī as patron of the poet Ḥāfiẓ in Shīrāz), but Shāh Shujā' was involved in disputes with his brother Maḥmūd, governor in Iṣfahān, till the latter's death. Maḥmūd had sought the help of the Muẓaffarids' old enemies, the Jalāyirids, and when he had at last secured Iṣfahān, Shāh Shujā' led an expedition into Azerbayjan against the Jalāyirid Ḥusayn b. Uways. But the shadow of Tīmūr was now falling across Persia. Shāh Shujā' hastened to submit to the great conqueror. His successors, however, were less circumspect. Before his death in 786/1384 Shāh Shujā' had divided his possessions between his brother Aḥmad (Kirmān) and his son Zayn-al-'Ābidīn (Fārs and the capital Shīrāz), and dynastic disputes over the various parts of the Muẓaffarid dominions were to disunite and weaken the dynasty fatally. Zayn-al-'Ābidīn submitted at first to Tīmūr, but Tīmūr later sacked Iṣfahan after his tax-collectors there had been killed in a popular rising. The last Muẓaffarid, Manṣūr, was ruler over all Fārs and Iraq when Tīmūr resolved in 795/1393 to extinguish the independent dynasties of western Persia; Manṣūr was killed in battle and the surviving Muẓaffarids massacred.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Lane Poole, 249-50; Justi, 460.
Zambaur, 254.
EI[1] 'Muẓaffarids', 'Shāh Shudjā'' (K. V. Zettersteen).

⟨63⟩
The Jalāyirids
736–835/1336–1432
Iraq, Kurdistan and Azerbayjan

736/1336	Tāj-ad-Dīn Ḥasan Buzurg
757/1356	Uways I
776/1374	Jalāl-ad-Dīn Ḥusayn I
784/1382	Ghiyāth-ad-Dīn Aḥmad
784–5/1382–3	Bāyazīd (in Kurdistan)
813/1410	Shāh Walad
814/1411	Maḥmūd, *first reign* (under the tutelage of the Queen-Mother Tandū)
818/1415	Uways II
824/1421	Muḥammad
825/1422	Maḥmud, *second reign*
827–35/1424–32	Ḥusayn II
	Qara Qoyunlu conquest of southern Iraq

The Jalāyirids were one of the successor-states to the Il-Khanids of Persia, succeeding to their territories in Iraq and Azerbayjan. The Jalāyir were, it seems, originally a Mongol tribe in Hülegü's following. The founder of the dynasty's fortunes was Ḥasan Buzurg (called *Buzurg* 'Great' to distinguish him from his enemy and rival of the Chūpānid family of Amīrs, Ḥasan Küchük 'the Small'), who had been governor of Anatolia under Sultan Abū-Sa'īd. He eventually prevailed over the Chūpānids and made Baghdad the centre of his power; nevertheless, he continued to recognise various Il-Khanid *fainéants* as his suzerains down to 747/1346, and it was left to his son Uways to assume full personal sovereignty.

Uways conquered Azerbayjan in 761/1360, and asserted his overlordship in Fārs over the disputing Muẓaffarids, but his successors had to cope with the rising power of the Qara Qoyunlu Turkmens in Diyārbakr and an invasion through the Caucasus into Azerbayjan by the ambitious khans of the Golden Horde. Uways's son Aḥmad opposed Tīmūr when the latter appeared in northern Persia and Iraq, and had to flee into exile with the Mamlūks of Egypt, only returning to Baghdad after Tīmūr's death in 807/1405. However, the shock

of the Tīmūrid invasions had much weakened the Jalāyirids' position. Azerbayjan quickly fell to the Qara Qoyunlu, and then Baghdad itself was captured by them in 815/1412. Only in Lower Iraq, at Wāsiṭ, Basra, and Shushtar, did minor Jalāyirid princes survive as vassals of the Tīmūrid Shāh Rukh, till Ḥusayn II was killed at Ḥilla in 835/1432.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Lane Poole, 246-8; Zambaur, 253.
EI[2] 'Djalāyir' (J. M. Smith Junr).

⟨64⟩

The Tīmūrids
771-912/1370-1506
Transoxania and Persia

1. Supreme rulers in Samarqand

771/1370	Tīmūr (Temür)
807/1405	Khalīl (till 812/1409)
807/1405	Shāh Rukh (at first in Khurasan only)
850/1447	Ulugh Beg
853/1449	ʿAbd-al-Laṭīf
854/1450	ʿAbdallāh Mīrzā
855/1451	Abū-Saʿīd
873/1469	Aḥmad
899-906/1494-1500	Maḥmūd b. Abī-Saʿīd
	Shaybānid conquest

2. Rulers in Khurasan after Ulugh Beg's death

853/1449	Bābur
861/1457	Maḥmūd b. Bābur
863/1459	Abū-Saʿīd
873/1469	Yādigār Muḥammad
875/1470	Ḥusayn Bayqara
912/1506	Badīʿ-az-Zamān
	Shaybānid conquest

3. Rulers in western Persia and Iraq after Tīmūr's death

807/1404	Mīrānshāh
812/1409	Khalīl
817/1414	ʿAyyāl
817-18/1414-15	Aylankar
	United with Shāh Rukh's territories

Tīmūr's family claimed descent from Chingiz Khan. His father was governor of Kish in Transoxania at a time when political authority in that province was fragmented and weakened through the incapacity of its nominal suzerains, the Chaghatayid Mongols of Tughluq Temür. Tīmūr used Transoxania as the base of, and nucleus for, the great steppe empire which he

built up, setting up as figure-heads there the descendants of Chingiz's son Ögedey, Soyurghetmish and Maḥmūd.

Tīmūr's first campaigns were in Khwārazm and Khurasan, after which he began the conquest of Persia in earnest; during the 'Five Years' War' beginning 797/1395, the Muẓaffarids of Fārs were destroyed and the Jalāyirid Aḥmad b. Uways driven from Iraq. However, Tīmūr's northern frontier was an open one, and his great rival in the steppes was Toqtamīsh, khan of the White Horde, who had united his wing of the Mongols with the Blue Horde and was thus supreme all over the Qïpchaq steppe; Tīmūr accordingly invaded Qïpchaq in 797/1395, penetrating as far as Moscow and Astrakhan. But his main efforts were directed against the rich territories of the Islamic heartlands, where his campaigns had a dissolving effect on the contemporary political structure. During the Indian campaign of 800/1398-9, Delhi was sacked and the end of the Tughluqids hastened, facilitating the rise of independent provincial sultanates such as those of Jawnpūr, Gujarāt, Mālwa, and Khāndesh. In the west, Tīmūr's defeat of the Ottoman Bayezit I at Ankara in 805/1402 gave the Turkmen principalities of Anatolia a few more decades' respite from absorption by the Ottoman sultans.

Before his death, which occurred just as he was about to leave for China, Tīmūr divided his territories amongst his sons and grandsons; but with the terror inspired by his personal presence gone, the later Tīmūrids eventually sank to the status of local rulers in Khurasan and Transoxania. At first there were two great kingdoms under Tīmūr's two sons Jalāl-ad-Dīn Mīrānshāh in western Persia and Iraq and Shāh Rukh in Khurasan and later also in Transoxania. Whereas Tīmūr's lifetime had been largely taken up with military conquest, the Tīmūrids of the fifteenth century made the eastern Islamic world a splendid cultural unity, whose achievements were outstanding in the fields of Persian and Chaghatay Turkish literature, in architecture, and in painting and book production, furthermore, Shāh Rukh's son Ulugh Beg became famed for his astronomical interests.

By 823/1420 Shāh Rukh had taken over all Tīmūr's former territories in Persia and Iraq, and still held a nominal suzerainty over India and China. His great-nephew Abū-Sa'īd was, next to the Ottoman Mehmet the Conqueror, the most powerful

monarch of his age, although he was unable to prevent the Özbegs from raiding across the Oxus and his campaign of 873/1468 to help the Qara Qoyunlu Ḥasan ʿAlī against the Aq Qoyunlu Uzun Ḥasan and to regain the western territories lost on Shāh Rukh's death, only ended in disaster. Ḥusayn Bayqara was the last great figure amongst the Tīmūrids, ruling from Herat over all Khurasan; it was at his court that the final florescence of Tīmūrid culture took place, with the poets Jāmī and ʿAlī Shīr Nevā'ī and the painter Bihzad working there.

The Tīmūrids were the last great Islamic dynasty of steppe origin; the rise of powerful states like the Ottomans, Ṣafavids, and Mughals, all employing firearms and more advanced military techniques, tilted the scales against any further large-scale invasions from the Eurasian steppes.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Lane Poole, 265-8; Justi, 472-3.
Sachau, 30-1; Zambaur, 269-70 and Table T.
R. M. Savory, 'The struggle for supremacy in Persia after the death of Tīmūr', *Der Islam*, XL (1964), 35-65.

⟨65⟩
The Qara Qoyunlu
782-873/1380-1468
Azerbayjan and Iraq

782/1380	Qara Muḥammad Turmush
791/1389	Qara Yūsuf
802/1400	*Tīmūrid invasion*
809/1406	Qara Yūsuf (reinstated)
823/1420	Iskandar
841/1438	Jihān Shāh
872-3/1467-8	Ḥasan 'Alī
	Aq Qoyunlu conquest

The confederation of the Qara Qoyunlu or 'Black Sheep' arose out of Turkmen elements pushed eastwards by the Mongol invasions. Their ruling family seems to have sprung from the Ivä clan of the Oghuz, and the seat of their power lay to the north of Lakes Van and Urmia, whence they gradually spread their authority over Azerbayjan and the eastern fringes of Anatolia.

Qara Muḥammad served the Jalāyirid sultan Uways, but his son Qara Yūsuf occupied Tabrīz, henceforth the capital of the Qara Qoyunlu, and made himself independent. Qara Yūsuf made the unfortunate decision to oppose Tīmūr, and had to flee to Mamlūk Egypt, only regaining Tabrīz in 809/1406. Now firmly re-established, the Qara Qoyunlu carried on warfare with their Aq Qoyunlu rivals in Diyārbakr, with the Georgians and Sharvān-Shāhs in the Caucasus, and against their suzerains the Tīmūrids in western Persia; once the forceful Shāh Rukh was dead, Jihān Shāh extended his rule over Iraq, Fārs, Kirmān, and even Oman. Finally, he attacked the redoubtable Aq Qoyunlu ruler Uzun Ḥasan in Diyārbakr, but was defeated and lost his life. Two years before his death, Jihān Shāh had also extinguished a subordinate line of Qara Qoyunlu which had ruled in Baghdad since Qara Yūsuf's time. When Jihān Shāh was killed, his son Ḥasan 'Ali returned from exile to Tabrīz, but was unable to secure the loyalty of the Qara Qoyunlu troops and was killed in 873/1468.

Politically, the rise of the Qara Qoyunlu confederation

meant the end of Il-Khanid rule in Iraq and western Persia, and the failure of the Tīmūrids also to maintain themselves in the west; ethnically, the concentration of Turkmens accelerated the process, already well advanced, whereby Azerbayjan has become predominantly Turkish in race and speech. As to the religious affiliations of the Qara Qoyunlu, later sources describe them as strongly Shīʿī, but contemporary sources are not so categorical; all one can safely say is that Shīʿī beliefs were certainly very prevalent amongst the Turkmens of western Asia at this time, as the rise of the Ṣafavids shows.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Lane Poole, 253; Zambaur, 257.
İA 'Kara-Koyunlular' (Faruk Sümer) (with detailed genealogical table).

⟨66⟩
The Aq Qoyunlu
780-914/1378-1508
Diyārbakr, eastern Anatolia, Azerbayjan

780/1378	Qara Yülük ʿUthmān
839/1435	Ḥamza, in dispute with his brother ʿAlī till 842/1438
848/1444	Jihāngīr
857/1453	Uzun Ḥasan
882/1478	Khalīl
883/1478	Yaʿqūb
896/1490	Baysonqur
898/1493	Rustam
902/1497	Aḥmad Gövde
903/1497	Murād (in Qum)
903/1498	Alwand (in Azerbayjan, later in Diyārbakr till his death in 910/1504)
903/1498	Muḥammad Mīrzā (in Jibāl and Fārs till 905/1500)
907-14/1502-8	Murād (latterly sole ruler)
	Ṣafavid conquest

The Aq Qoyunlu or 'White Sheep' were a confederation of Turkmens centred on Diyārbakr; their ruling stratum was drawn from the ancient Oghuz clan of the Bayundur, and already in the mid-fourteenth century this clan is mentioned in Byzantine sources as raiding Trebizond. The real founder of the dynasty was Qara Yülük ʿUthmān, whose mother was a Comnena, and who himself married a Byzantine princess; the links of the dynasty with the Trebizond emperors were for a long time close. Unlike the Qara Qoyunlu, Qara Yülük submitted to Tīmūr and fought for him against Bayezit at Ankara in 805/1402, being rewarded by the grant of Diyārbakr. Expansion to the east was for long blocked by the Qara Qoyunlu, but Uzun Ḥasan, the most prominent member of the dynasty, at last crushed Jihān Shāh in 872/1467. After defeating the Tīmūrid Abū-Saʿīd, he was able to extend Aq Qoyunlu rule across Persia to Khurasan and down to Iraq and the Persian Gulf.

Uzun Ḥasan's prime enemy, however, was the Ottomans,

who in the fifteenth century were mopping up the remaining Turkish principalities of Anatolia and pressing relentlessly eastwards. Anti-Ottoman policy made him ally with the Qaramānids, and he also tried to save Trebizond, to whose last emperors he was related through his Byzantine wife Despina, from the attacks of Mehmet the Conqueror. Under Uzun Ḥasan, the Aq Qoyunlu became a power of international significance. In 868/1464 diplomatic relations were opened with the Ottomans' Venetian enemies, and arms and munitions despatched from Venice. Yet Uzun Ḥasan's forces were no match for the Ottoman artillery at Terjān in 878/1473, and he was crushingly defeated. His son Yaʿqūb carried on the struggle, but thereafter the dynasty was rent by internecine strife and succession disputes. The Qaramānids had fallen to the Ottomans, and the ideological bases of the Sunnī Aq Qoyunlu power were now being undermined by the Shīʿī propaganda spread by the Ṣafavids amongst the Turkmens of Anatolia. In 906/1501 Alwand was defeated near Nakhchevān by Shāh Ismāʿīl, and the last Aq Qoyunlu was forced to flee to the Ottoman sultan, Selīm. An autonomous Aq Qoyunlu principality at Mārdīn in Diyārbakr had been extinguished by Alwand shortly before his own defeat, and the dynasty's rule was now finished everywhere.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Lane Poole, 254; Zambaur, 258-9.
İA 'Aḳ Ḳoyunlular' (M. H. Yinanç) (with detailed genealogical table).
EI² 'Aḳ Ḳoyunlu' (V. Minorsky).
R. M. Savory, 'The struggle for supremacy in Persia after the death of Tīmūr', *Der Islam*, LX (1964), 35-65.

⟨67⟩
The Ṣafavids
907-1145/1501-1732
Persia

907/1501	Ismāʿīl I	
930/1524	Ṭahmāsp I	
984/1576	Ismāʿīl II	
985/1578	Muḥammad Khudābanda	
996/1588	ʿAbbās I	
1038/1629	Ṣafī I	
1052/1642	ʿAbbās II	
1077/1666	Sulaymān I (Safī II)	
1105/1694	Ḥusayn I	
1135/1722	Ṭahmāsp II	
1145/1732	ʿAbbās III	nominal rulers in certain parts of Persia only
1163/1749	Sulaymān II	
1163/1750	Ismāʿīl III	
1166/1753	Ḥusayn II	
1200/1786	Muḥammad	

Although Turkish-speaking, the Ṣafavids were quite probably of Kurdish origin; we lack reliable information here because once they had consolidated their power in Persia, the Ṣafavids deliberately falsified evidence pertaining to their origins. But there is no doubt that like many of the dynasties of the Anatolia-Diyārbakr-Azerbayjan region, where Turkmens were numerous and politically influential, they arose from dervish origins. Shaykh Ṣafī-ad-Dīn (d. 735/1334) established his Ṣūfī order of the Ṣafawiyya at Ardabīl in Azerbayjan, and whilst he himself was probably a Sunnī, his order flourished in an area where heterodoxy and especially Shīʿism was rife; accordingly, during the course of the fifteenth century, it became openly Shīʿī in emphasis.

An intense propaganda was now carried on amongst the Turkmens of eastern Anatolia in an effort to subvert first the power of the Qara Qoyunlu and then that of the Aq Qoyunlu; and in 907/1501 Ismāʿīl b. Ḥaydar seized Azerbayjan from the Aq Qoyunlu, brought the whole of Persia under his control in the ensuing ten years, and thus established the Ṣafavid mon-

archy. This rule soon became a theocratic one, for Ismā'īl and his successors not only professed Alid origins, but also claimed a semi-divine status as reincarnations of the Shī'ī Imāms. The Turkish tribesmen supporting them, the so-called *Qïzïl-bash* or 'red-heads' (from the red caps which they wore), thus owed them a spiritual as well as political allegiance. Shī'ism was imposed as the state religion in a country which up till then had been, at least officially, predominantly Sunnī. The Ṣafavid period is thus of supreme importance in Persian history because of this consolidation of Shī'ism there; in the process, Persia acquired a new sense of solidarity and nationhood which has enabled her to survive into modern times with her national spirit and territorial integrity virtually unimpaired.

Militarily, Shāh Ismā'īl and his successors had to face the unrelenting hostility of their Sunnī neighbours, the Ottomans in the west and the Turkmen Özbegs in the north-east. On the Oxus frontier, the Shāhs just about managed to hold their own, with frontier towns like Herat, Mashhad and Sarakhs frequently changing hands; but Turkmen incursions for plunder and slaves continued well into the nineteenth century. The Ottomans were more dangerous, being at the height of their power in the sixteenth century; Selīm the Grim's victory over the Ṣafavids at Chaldirān in 920/1514 was a triumph of logistics for the Ottomans, as well as a display of superior firepower (like the Mamlūks of Egypt, the Ṣafavids were for long curiously averse from the use of artillery and small arms). Soon afterwards, Kurdistan, Diyārbakr, and Baghdad passed into Ottoman hands, and Azerbayjan itself was frequently invaded; later, the Ṣafavid capital was moved from vulnerable Tabrīz to Qazwīn and then to Iṣfahān.

The reign of Shāh 'Abbās I, near contemporary of such great rulers as Elizabeth I of England, Philip II of Spain, Ivan the Terrible of Russia and the Mughal emperor Akbar, marks the apex of Ṣafavid political power and also of Ṣafavid culture and civilisation, some of the greatest achievements of which are preserved in the unparalleled architectural beauties of Iṣfahān. In his reign, the Ottomans were hurled from Azerbayjan, and Persian control over the eastern Caucasus and the Persian Gulf strengthened. Diplomatic relations with Europe were established (although the projected Ṣafavid-European grand alliance

against the Ottomans never materialised), and commercial and cultural contacts grew. In order to counteract the political influence in the state of the *Qïzïl-bash*, Shāh 'Abbās recruited Georgian and Circassian converts as slave guards, and favoured the growth of a group of Turkmens owing allegiance to himself personally, and not to the chiefs of the great tribes (the *Shāh-seven* or 'lovers of the Shāh').

After the death of Shāh 'Abbās II in 1077/1666, the decline of the dynasty was obvious. Ṣafavid rule in the east stretched to Qandahār in Afghanistan, but there must have been a certain amount of anti-Shī'ī sentiment in this strongly Sunnī region, and the Ṣafavid governor of Afghanistan, Mīr Ways, declared himself independent in the early years of the eighteenth century. In 1135/1722 his son Maḥmūd invaded Persia, and for several years, till the rise of Nādir Shāh, the Afghans occupied much of Persia. Various members of the Ṣafavid family were raised to power as puppet rulers after this, but the effective rule of the dynasty was finished in 1145/1732.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Lane Poole, 255-9; Justi, 479.
Zambaur, 261-2.
R. M. Savory, 'The Safavids in Persia' in *Cambridge History of Islam*, II (forthcoming).

⟨68⟩
The Afshārids
1148-1210/1736-95
Persia

1148/1736	Nādir Shāh, Ṭahmāsp Qulī Khan
1160/1747	'Ādil Shāh, 'Alī Qulī Khan
1161/1748	Ibrāhīm
1161-1210/1748-95	Shāh Rukh (in Khurasan)
	Zands and Qājārs

Nādir was a chieftain of the Afshār, a Turkmen tribe settled in northern Khurasan; it was in this home territory that Nādir later constructed his stronghold and treasury, the Qal'at-i Nādirī. In this period of the Ṣafavids' death-throes, when much of Persia was in the hands of the Afghans, the national unity of Persia, which had been carefully built up by the early Ṣafavids, seemed likely to disintegrate. It was to be Nādir's task to re-establish the territorial integrity of Persia, albeit at the price of leaving the country financially and economically exhausted.

Nādir's rise to power began through his service under the Ṣafavid sultan, Ṭahmāsp II (whence the name he adopted of Ṭahmāsp Qulī 'slave of Ṭahmāsp'). He began systematically to clear the Afghan invaders from Persia, and when by 1140/1727 this had been achieved, Ṭahmāsp rewarded him with the governorship of Khurasan, Kirmān, Sīstān, and Māzandarān. With so much territory under his personal control, Nādir began to act like an independent ruler, now coining his own money. Turning to external enemies, he drove the Ottomans out of Azerbayjan and Hamadān in 1143/1730 and penetrated through the Caucasus deep into the heart of Daghestan. Ṭahmāsp's conclusion of a treaty with Turkey and Russia which was unfavourable to Persia's interests provided Nādir with a pretext to dethrone Ṭahmāsp, setting up another Ṣafavid prince as a puppet, until in 1148/1736 he was himself proclaimed Shāh. Nādir seems at this point to have sought an end to the ancient Shī'ī-Sunnī hostility of Persia and Turkey, and he announced the abandonment of Twelver Shī'ism as the state religion and the establishment of a new faith, a much-attenuated form of Shī'ism whose spiritual head was to be the sixth imām, Ja'far

aṣ-Ṣādiq. Unfortunately, this conciliatory move did not bring about a real détente with the Ottomans.

The expense of continual warfare drove Nādir into his brilliantly successful Indian campaign of 1151-2/1738-9, as a result of which the Mughal emperor Muḥammad Shāh had to cede all his provinces north and west of the Indus, and to pay an enormous tribute. Because of this last, Nādir declared the people of Persia exempt from taxation for three years. An attempted assassination of Nādir in 1154/1741, in which the complicity of his son Riḍā Qulī was suspected, caused a deterioration in Nādir's character, so that his policies became more and more cruel and erratic. Rebellions broke out in the provinces against his exactions, and in 1160/1747 a group of Afshār and Qājār chiefs finally did murder him. Two of his nephews reigned briefly, and then his grandson Shāh Rukh held Khurasan for nearly a further half-century, but the glory departed with Nādir; Persia was exhausted now, and ready for the period of relative peace and prosperity under the Zands.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Lane Poole, 257-9, 262; Zambaur, 261. EI[1] 'Nādir Shāh' (V. Minorsky).

⟨69⟩

The Zands

1163-1209/1750-94

Persia

1163/1750	Muḥammad Karīm Khan
1193/1779	Abū-l-Fat'ḥ } conjointly Muḥammad 'Alī }
1193-5/1779-81	Ṣādiq (in Shīrāz)
1193-9/1779-85	'Alī Murād (in Iṣfahān)
1199/1785	Ja'far
1203-9/1789-94	Luṭf 'Alī
	Qājārs

In the chaos which followed Nādir Shāh's death, various military chiefs seized power in the provinces of Persia. Nādir's Afghan commander Aḥmad Durrānī founded in Qandahār an important Afghan state whose territories included Nādir's conquests in northwestern India. In Khurasan, the blind Afshārid Shāh Rukh held on precariously to power. In Māzandarān, the Qājār chief Muḥammad Ḥasan maintained his local authority, and in Azerbayjan, another of Nādir's Afghan generals, Āzād, established himself. In southern Persia, the chief force at first was the Bakhtiyārī leader 'Alī Mardān, who had taken Iṣfahān and raised to the throne there a puppet Ṣafavid, Ismā'īl III (1163/1750). 'Alī Mardān's lieutenant and ally was Muḥammad Karīm Zand, a soldier of lowly Lūrī origin, and when 'Alī was murdered, Muḥammad made himself sole ruler of southern Persia.

Āzād capitulated peacefully to Muḥammad, but the latter had a long struggle with the Qājār Muḥammad Ḥasan before his power in Persia as a whole was made firm. Muḥammad Karīm Khān never himself assumed the title of Shāh, but reigned from Shīrāz as *Wakīl* or Regent for the Ṣafavid Ismā'īl III. Muḥammad's reign of almost thirty years was one of clemency and moderation, and the country flourished under his enlightened rule; amongst other things, commercial relations with Britain via Bushire on the Persian Gulf were encouraged. But the death of Muḥammad was the signal for disastrous disputes over the succession to break out within the family. 'Alī

Murād finally secured the throne, but died soon afterwards, and in the reign of Ja'far, the power of the Zands' Qājār rivals grew until the Zands had to abandon Iṣfahān to them. The last Zand, Luṭf 'Alī Khan, a popular ruler and an able general, took up arms against the Qājārs and was successful for a while, but in 1209/1794 he was captured at Kirmān by Āghā Muḥammad and brutally murdered; thus the whole of Persia then fell to the Qājārs.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Lane Poole, 260, 262; Zambaur, 261, 264.

⟨70⟩
The Qājārs
1193-1342/1779-1924
Persia

1133/1721	Fat'ḥ 'Alī Khan	tribal chiefs in Māzandarān
1163/1750	Muḥammad Ḥasan Khan	tribal chiefs in Māzandarān
1184/1770	Ḥusayn Qulī Khan	tribal chiefs in Māzandarān
1193/1779	Āghā Muḥammad	
1212/1797	Fatḥ 'Alī Shāh	
1250/1834	Muḥammad	
1264/1848	Nāṣir-ad-Dīn	
1313/1896	Muẓaffar-ad-Dīn	
1324/1907	Muḥammad 'Alī	
1327-42/1909-24	Aḥmad	
	Pahlavī Shāhs	

The Qājār tribe of Turkmens had probably been settled near Astarābād in the Caspian coastlands since Mongol times; later, they were one of the seven great Turkmen tribes supporting the early Ṣafavids and comprising the *Qïzïl-bash*. With the disintegration of the Ṣafavid empire in the early eighteenth century, the ambitious Qājār chiefs began to play a more-than-local rôle in Persian affairs. They survived the hostility of Nādir Shāh, and after his death, expanded across northern Persia to Azerbayjan, where Āghā Muḥammad, the future Shāh, became governor in 1170/1757. In the struggle for supremacy, the Qājārs were victorious over the Zands of Shīrāz; Persian suzerainty was re-established, albeit temporarily, over Georgia; and the Afshārid Shāh Rukh removed from Khurasan. The frightful Āghā Muḥammad, whose excesses are doubtless in part explicable by the fact that as a boy he had been castrated by Nādir's nephew 'Ādil Shāh, was thus the founder of the dynasty under which Persia was to move definitely into the modern world, acquiring an important strategic and economic rôle in international affairs. It was also under Āghā Muḥammad that Tehran, previously a town of only moderate importance, became the capital (1200/1786); in this way began the centripetal movement of all life towards the centre which is such a feature of modern Persia.

Regular and continuous diplomatic relations with the European powers date from Fat'ḥ 'Alī Shāh's reign, when Persia was courted by Britain on one side and Napoleonic France on the other, on account of her strategic position across the routes to the East. A by-product of this attention from the West was the introduction of European techniques and training into the Persian army. During the nineteenth century, Tsarist Russian imperialism was a constant threat; by the Treaty of Turkmenchay in 1243/1828, Persia relinquished all claim to territories in eastern Armenia and the Caucasus, but the Russian advance in central Asia posed further potential danger to Persia's north-eastern frontier. For long, the Qājārs were unable to renounce the heritage of eastern conquest left by the Ṣafavids and Nādir, and disputes with Afghanistan over Herat continued until 1273/1857.

Through the mutual jealousies of the Great Powers and the astuteness of Nāṣir-ad-Dīn Shāh, Persia was much more successful than the Ottoman Empire in retaining its territorial integrity. Nevertheless, the cost of warfare and royal extravagance were plunging the nation deeply into foreign debt, thereby increasing the economic stranglehold of the European creditor nations. During the reign of the weaker Muẓaffar-ad-Dīn Shāh, there arose a movement demanding some degree of political liberalism and the granting of a constitution, demands which had to be met in 1906. The prestige and powers of the Qājārs were now perceptibly fading. During the First World War Persia remained officially neutral, but despite this, Turkish, Russian, and British troops fought over her soil, and at the end of the war, various local rebellions and separatist movements grew up in the provinces. Accordingly, it was not difficult for the soldier Riḍā (Rizā) Khan, Commander-in-Chief of the army, to get the National Assembly to depose the Qājārs in 1924, after which he himself ascended the Persian throne as Riḍā (Rizā) Shāh Pahlavī, father of the present Shāh, Muḥammad Riḍā.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Lane Poole, 260, 261; Zambaur, 261-3.

TEN

AFGHANISTAN AND INDIA

⟨71⟩
The Ghaznavids
366-582/977-1186
Khurasan, Afghanistan and northern India

366/977	Nāṣir-ad-Dawla Sebüktigin (governor on behalf of the Sāmānids)
387/997	Ismā'īl
388/998	Yamīn-ad-Dawla Maḥmūd
421/1030	Jalāl-ad-Dawla Muḥammad, *first reign*
421/1031	Shibhā-ad-Dawla Mas'ūd I
432/1041	Muḥammad, *second reign*
432/1041	Shihāb-ad-Dawla Mawdūd
441/1050	Mas'ūd II
441/1050	Bahā'-ad-Dawla 'Alī
441/1050	'Izz-ad-Dawla 'Abd-ar-Rashīd
444/1053	*Qiwām-ad-Dawla Toghrïl, usurper*
444/1053	Jamāl-ad-Dawla Farrukhzād
451/1059	Ẓahīr-ad-Dawla Ibrāhīm
492/1099	'Alā'-da-Dawla Mas'ūd III
508/1115	Kamāl-ad-Dawla Shīrzād
509/1115	Sulṭān-ad-Dawla Arslan Shāh
512/1118	Yamīn-ad-Dawla Bahrām Shāh
547/1152	Mu'izz-ad-Dawla Khusraw Shāh
555-82/1160-86	Tāj-ad-Dawla Khusraw Malik
	Ghūrid conquest

On the death in 350/961 of the Sāmānid Amīr 'Abd-al-Malik, the Turkish slave commander of the Sāmānid forces in Khurasan, Alptigin, attempted to manipulate the succession in his

own favour. The attempt failed, and he was obliged to withdraw with some of his troops to Ghazna in eastern Afghanistan. Here on the periphery of the Sāmānid empire, and facing the pagan land of India, a series of Turkish slave commanders followed Alptigin, governing on behalf of the Sāmānids, till in 366/977 Sebüktigin came to power. Under him, the Ghaznavid tradition of raiding the plains of India in search of plunder and slaves was established, but it was his son Maḥmūd who became fully independent and who achieved a reputation throughout the Islamic world as hammer of the infidels, penetrating down the Ganges to Muttra and Kanawj and into the Kathiawar peninsula to attack the famous idol-temple of Somnāth. In the north, he set up the Oxus as his frontier with the rival power of the Qarakhanids, and annexed Khwārazm. In the west, the former Sāmānid province of Khurasan was held against Qarakhanid incursions, and at the very end of his life, Maḥmūd marched to Ray and Hamadān in western Persia and seized them from the Būyids (420/1029).

Maḥmūd's empire at his death was thus the most extensive and imposing edifice known since the heyday of the early 'Abbāsid caliphate, and the military machine which made it possible was the most effective army of its age. Also, the Sultan's enthusiastic adoption of Persian administrative and cultural ways largely cut off the Ghaznavids from their pagan Turkish steppe background. But under his son Mas'ūd, Maḥmūd's empire—essentially a personal creation—crumbled in the west: Khurasan and Khwārazm were lost to the Seljuqs, and the middle years of the eleventh century were spent in warfare with them for possession of Sīstān and western Afghanistan. By Ibrāhīm's accession in 451/1059, a *modus vivendi* was worked out with the Seljuqs and peace reigned for over half a century. Reduced as it now was to eastern Afghanistan and northern India, the Indian orientation of the Ghaznavid empire became more pronounced. In the early twelfth century, the Seljuq sultan Sanjar intervened in Ghaznavid affairs on more than one occasion, and Bahrām Shāh's reign culminated in a frightful sack of Ghazna by the 'World-Incendiary', the Ghūrid 'Alā'-ad-Dīn Jihān-sūz (545/1150-1). The rise of the Ghūrids in central Afghanistan reduced the power of the last Ghaznavids, and Khusraw Shāh and Khusraw Malik ruled

essentially in the Panjab, until the Ghūrid Ghiyāth-ad-Dīn Muḥammad finally extinguished the line (582/1186).

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Lane Poole, 285-90; Justi, 444.
Zambaur, 282-3.
C. E. Bosworth, *The Ghaznavids, their empire in Afghanistan and eastern Iran 994-1040* (Edinburgh 1963).
idem, 'The titulature of the early Ghaznavids', *Oriens*, XV (1962), 210-33.
EI[2] 'Ghaznavids' (B. Spuler).

<72>
The Ghūrids
c. 390–612/c. 1000–1215
Khurasan, Afghanistan, northern India

1. Principal line in Ghūr and then Ghazna

?	Muḥammad b. Sūrī
401/1011	Abū-'Alī
?	Shīth
?	'Abbās
?	Muḥammad
?	Quṭb-ad-Dīn Ḥasan
493/1100	'Izz-ad-Dīn Ḥusayn
540/1146	Sayf-ad-Dīn Sūrī
544/1149	Bahā'-ad-Dīn Sām I
544/1149	'Alā'-ad-Dīn Ḥusayn
556/1161	Sayf-ad-Dīn Muḥammad
558/1163	Ghiyāth-ad-Dīn Muḥammad
599/1203	Shihāb-ad-Dīn or Mu'izz-ad-Dīn Muḥammad (ruler in Ghazna from 569/1173)
602/1206	Ghiyāth-ad-Dīn Maḥmūd
609/1212	Bahā'-ad-Dīn Sām II
610/1213	'Alā'-ad-Dīn Atsïz
611–12/1214–15	'Alā'-ad-Dīn or Ḍiyā'-ad-Dīn Muḥammad
	Khwārazmian conquest

2. Line in Bāmiyān and Ṭukhāristān

540/1145	Fakhr-ad-Dīn Mas'ūd
558/1163	Shams-ad-Dīn Muḥammad
588/1192	Bahā'-ad-Dīn Sām
602–12/1206–15	Jalāl-ad-Dīn 'Alī
	Khwārazmian conquest

The inaccessible central region of Afghanistan, called Ghūr, was almost wholly *terra incognita* to the early Islamic geographers, known only as a source of slaves and as the home of a

bellicose race of Iranian mountaineers who remained pagan until well into the eleventh century. In this century, the Ghaznavids led raids into Ghūr and made the local chiefs of the Shansabānī family their vassals; but in the early twelfth century the Ghaznavids' fortunes waned and Seljuq influence spread through Ghūr, so that ʻIzz-ad-Dīn Ḥusayn, the first fully historical figure of the dynasty, paid tribute to Sanjar. Attempts by the Ghaznavid sultan Bahrām Shāh to re-assert his declining influence led to the Ghūrids' sack of Ghazna in 545/1150-1 and the eventual acquisition by them of the Ghaznavid possessions in eastern Afghanistan. In the west, ʻAlā'-ad-Dīn Ḥusayn's expansionist policies were at first checked by Sanjar, but the collapse shortly afterwards of the Seljuq sultanate in Khurasan allowed the Ghūrids to establish an empire stretching almost from the Caspian Sea to northern India, where the Ghaznavid traditions of *jihād* were inherited and were kept up.

The joint architects of this achievement were the two brothers Ghiyāth-ad-Dīn Muḥammad and Muʻizz-ad-Dīn Muḥammad, the former campaigning mainly in the west and the latter in India. Bāmiyān and the lands along the upper Oxus were ruled by another branch of the Ghūrid family. Employing both native Ghūrīs and the ubiquitous Turkish slave troops, Ghiyāth-ad-Dīn confronted the Khwārazm-Shāhs and the latter's suzerains the Qara Khitay; at one point he invaded Khwārazm itself, and by his death held all Khurasan as far west as Bisṭām.

Yet it seems that the Ghūrids' resources of manpower were inadequate for holding this empire together, whereas their Khwārazmian adversaries could draw freely on the central Asian steppes for troops. After Muʻizz-ad-Dīn's death in 602/1206, the dynasty was racked by internal squabbles; a group of the Ghūrids' Turkish soldiers made themselves independent in Ghazna, and the Khwārazm-Shāh was able to step in and incorporate the Ghūrid territories in his own great empire. This Khwārazmian domination was, however, of only brief duration, for all the eastern Islamic world was shortly afterwards overwhelmed by Chingiz Khan's Mongols. Moreover, the Turkish generals of Muʻizz-ad-Dīn continued to uphold Ghūrid policies and traditions in northern India, where Quṭb-

ad-Dīn Aybak was installed as ruler in Lahore by one of the last Ghūrids (see below, s.v. Delhi Sultans).

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Lane Poole, 291-4; Justi, 455-6. Zambaur, 280-1, 284; EI² 'Ghūrids' (C. E. Bosworth).

⟨73⟩
The Delhi Sultans
602-962/1206-1555
Northern India

1. Mu'izzī or Slave Kings

602/1206 Quṭb-ad-Dīn Aybak
607/1210 Ārām Shāh
607/1211 Shams-ad-Dīn Iletmish (Iltutmish)
633/1236 Rukn-ad-Dīn Fīrūz Shāh I
634/1236 Jalālat-ad-Dīn Raḍiyya Begum
637/1240 Mu'izz-ad-Dīn Bahrām Shāh
639/1242 'Alā'-ad-Dīn Mas'ūd Shāh
644/1246 Nāṣir-ad-Dīn Maḥmūd Shāh I
664/1266 Ghiyāth-ad-Dīn Balban
686/1287 Mu'izz-ad-Dīn Kay-Qubādh
689/1290 Shams-ad-Dīn Kayūmarth

2. Khaljīs

689/1290 Jalāl-ad-Dīn Fīrūz Shāh II
695/1296 Rukn-ad-Dīn Ibrāhīm Shāh I
695/1296 'Alā'-ad-Dīn Muḥammad Shāh I
715/1316 Shihāb-ad-Dīn 'Umar Shāh
716/1316 Quṭb-ad-Dīn Mubārak Shāh
720/1320 usurpation of Nāṣir-ad-Dīn Khusraw Shāh

3. Tughluqids

720/1320 Ghiyāth-ad-Dīn Tughluq Shāh I
725/1325 Ghiyāth-ad-Dīn Muḥammad Shāh II
752/1351 Maḥmūd
752/1351 Fīrūz Shāh III

790/1388	Ghiyāth-ad-Dīn Tughluq Shāh II
791/1389	Abū-Bakr Shāh
792/1390	Nāṣir-ad-Dīn Muḥammad Shāh III
795/1393	'Alā'-ad-Dīn Sikandar Shāh I
795/1393	Nāṣir-ad-Dīn Maḥmud Shāh II, *first reign*
797/1395	Nuṣrat Shāh (disputing power with Maḥmud Shāh II)
801/1399	Maḥmūd Shāh II, *second reign*
816-17/1413-14	Dawlat Khan Lōdī

4. Sayyids

817/1414	Khiḍr Khan
824/1421	Mu'izz-ad-Dīn Mubārak Shāh II
838/1435	Muḥammad Shāh IV
849-55/1446-51	'Alā'-ad-Dīn 'Ālam Shāh

5. Lōdīs

855/1451	Bahlūl Lōdī
894/1489	Niẓām Khan Sikandar II
c. 923-32/c. 1517-26	Ibrāhīm II
	Mughal conquest under Bābur

6. Sūrīs or Afghans

947/1540	Shīr Shāh Sūr
952/1545	Islām Shāh
961/1554	Muḥammad v 'Ādil Shāh
961/1554	Ibrāhīm III
962/1555	Aḥmad Khan Sikandar Shāh III
	Final Mughal conquest by Humāyūn

Islam was first implanted in the lower Indus valley by the Arab governors of the Umayyad caliphs; in 92/711 Sind was definitely conquered for the new faith by Muḥammad b. Qāsim. This foothold was retained during the ensuing three centuries, although some of the Muslim communities were affected by the propaganda of Ismā'īlī Shī'ī missionaries, who were working intensively at this time in many parts of the Islamic world, from North Africa to the Yemen and the borders of India. There were, too, trade contacts between the Muslim Near East

and the coastlands of Gujarāt, Bombay, and the Ḍeccan, just as there had been similar contacts in classical times, but these sporadic links hardly affected the interior, *sc.* the overwhelming land-mass of the subcontinent.

It was the Turkish Ghaznavids who first brought the full weight of Muslim military power into northern India, overthrowing such powerful native dynasties as the Hindūshāhīs of Wayhind by 417/1026, reducing many of the Rājput rulers to tributary status and penetrating as far as Somnāth in Gujarāt, Kālinjār, and Benares. Although Maḥmūd of Ghazna achieved a glowing reputation in the Islamic world as the scourge of the Hindu idolators, it is clear that the sultan was not a fanatical zealot, bent on the conversion or extermination of the Indians; Indian troops formed a substantial element of the Ghaznavid army, and it does not seem that conversion to Islam was a condition of recruitment. The Ghaznavids' interest in northern India was primarily financial, the subcontinent being regarded as an almost inexhaustible reservoir of treasure and slaves, but they did occupy the Panjab and make it their permanent base in India, and towards the end of their power, Lahore became their capital.

There was thus in the Panjab, all ready to hand, a useful springboard for the Indian conquests of Mu'izz-ad-Dīn Ghūrī and his generals in the last years of the twelfth century and the opening ones of the next. Having taken the Panjab from the last Ghaznavid, he expanded into the Gangetic plain, coming up against the local Rājput princes: firstly Prithvi Rāj III, the powerful Chāhamāna or Chawhān king of Ajmer and Delhi, was overthrown (588/1192), and then Jayachandra, the Gāhaḍavāla king of Benares and Kanawj (590/1194). Amongst Mu'izz-ad-Dīn's Turkish commanders, Quṭb-ad-Dīn Aybak was placed in charge of all the Indian conquests during his master's lifetime, when the sultan had to be absent in Khurasan. He held on to the Ghūrid conquests in the Panjab and the Ganges-Jumna Dōāb, and raided as far as Gujarāt. Another general, Ikhtiyār-ad-Dīn Muḥammad Khaljī, penetrated into Bihār and Bengal, making Gawr or Lakhnāwatī his base there, and he even attacked Assam. It is in the period of the Ghūrids and their commanders, then, that the permanent establishment of Islam in northern India begins: long-established Hindu

ities there were humbled, and the foundations of several
m sultanates laid. On the other hand, it must be recalled
hroughout the period of the Delhi sultanate the power of
Hindu and especially Rājput chiefs continued in the
ns away from the centres of Turco-Afghan military
pation.
hen Mu'izz-ad-Dīn died in 602/1206, Aybak assumed
r in Lahore as *Malik* or ruler on behalf of the Ghūrid
n in Fīrūzkūh. Henceforth, Ghazna and the Afghan parts
e Ghūrid empire were severed from India, falling briefly
e Khwārazm-Shāhs and then to the Mongols. Aybak and
uccessors down to 689/1290 are often called the Slave
s, although only three of them, Aybak, Iletmish, and
n, were of servile origin and they had all been manumitted
eir masters before achieving royal power. Nor did these
ns belong to one line only, but to three distinct ones. Under
ish, the real architect of an independent sultanate in Delhi,
, formerly in the hands of the Mu'izzī general Nāṣir-ad-Dīn
icha, was added to the Delhi sultanate. He also managed to
the Khwārazmians out of his dominions, but the Mongols
ran the Panjab in 639/1241, sacking Lahore and then
ncing as far as Ucch. A succession of weak sultans brought
nal discord, and the unity of the sultanate was only assured
by the regency and then the independent rule of the capable
an, who was originally one of the famous band of forty
ish slaves (*Chihilgān*) of Iletmish. Balban continued the
of his master in placing the sultanate on a firm military
governmental basis by his reforms and in exalting the
er of the sovereign on traditional Persian lines. The spiri-
and moral links with the rest of the Islamic world were
gthened. Already, Iletmish had sought investiture from
Abbāsid caliph al-Mustanṣir; even after the murder of the
aliph in Baghdad, al-Musta'ṣim, the Mu'izzī sultans long
inued to put his name on their coins. In this way, one can
rn the motif of identification with Sunnī Islam as a whole
of acknowledgement of the spiritual leadership of the
hate; these motifs run through much of the history of
n Islam, reflecting its struggle to maintain its identity
st the pressure of the surrounding Hindu environment.
ortant, too, as a fertilising influence in the culture of this

period were the waves of refugees from Persia and Transoxania who fled before the Mongols and who found their way into India during the reigns of Iletmish and Balban; in later times, such as the reign of Muḥammad b. Tughluq, infusions of fresh blood continued to vitalise Indo-Muslim culture.

In 689/1290 the Mu'izzī sultans were succeeded by the line of the Khaljī Jalāl-ad-Dīn Fīrūz Shāh II. The Khalaj were originally a Turkish people (or perhaps a Turkicised people of a different ethnic origin) inhabiting eastern Afghanistan; it seems very likely that the modern Ghilzay Afghans are their descendants. In the reign of Mu'izz-ad-Dīn, the Khalaj played a prominent part in the Ghūrid invasions of India, and it was Ikhtiyār-ad-Dīn Muḥammad Khaljī who first brought Islam into Bengal and eastern India. The pressing task for Fīrūz Shāh II was to keep out the Mongols; it was, nevertheless, during his reign that large numbers of Mongols converted to Islam were allowed to settle in the Delhi area. The outstanding figure of the Khaljī dynasty is undoubtedly 'Alā'-ad-Dīn Muḥammad, who considered himself a second Alexander and who had grandiose dreams of assembling a vast empire. In actuality, he had first of all to cope with the threat of the Chaghatayid Mongols on his north-western frontier, who in the years up to 706/1306 several times raided as far as Delhi. 'Alā'-ad-Dīn's ambitions found their main outlet, however, in south India, the rich area south of the Vindhya Mts as yet unattacked by the Muslims. An attack in 695/1296 on Devagiri or Deogīr in the western Deccan, capital of the Yādavas, brought him the wealth which he afterwards used to win the sultanate for himself, and when he was firmly established on the throne, he sent further armies to the southernmost tip of the Deccan. 'Alā'-ad-Dīn continued to employ the traditional designation of *Nāṣir Amīr al-Mu'minīn* 'Helper of the Commander of the Faithful'; the first and last Indian Muslim ruler to appropriate for himself the caliphal title of *Amīr al-Mu'minīn* was his son Quṭb-ad-Dīn Mubārak Shāh I.

The Khaljī line collapsed when Khusraw Khan, a low-caste Gujarātī convert from Hinduism and favourite of the last Khaljī sultan Mubārak Shāh I, apostasised from Islam and usurped the throne in Delhi. Muslim control was re-established by the Turco-Indian commander Ghāzī Malik Tughluq and his

son Muḥammad, who in 720/1320 inaugurated the reign of the Tughluqids. Tughluq did much to restore the economic and administrative stability of the Sultanate and to reimpose Muslim control over the Deccan. Muḥammad is an enigmatic figure, a great scholar of Persian and of the sciences and a skilful general; yet his behaviour was often erratic and his judgement poor. The increases of taxation needed to keep the sultanate on a sound financial basis made him unpopular, and his decision of 727/1327 to transfer the capital from Delhi to Deogīr, now re-named Dawlatābād, proved disastrous. On the other hand, he did successfully repel the Chaghatayid Mongol Tarmashīrīn's invasion from Transoxania (729/1329), but his project for taking advantage of Il-Khanid weakness and invading central Asia via the Pamirs (if such was really his intention, for the statements in the sources are vague about this) was pure fantasy. Muḥammad b. Tughluq had diplomatic relations with the Islamic world beyond India; he was in touch with the Egyptian Mamlūks and sought investiture from the 'Abbāsid puppet caliph in Cairo. Nevertheless, the diversion of energies to unrealistic military projects on the northern frontiers of India led to a weakening of the Tughluqids' hold on the Deccan: an independent Muslim kingdom arose at Madura in the extreme south and lasted till it was overthrown by the rising Hindu kingdom of Vijayanagar, and in 748/1347 the Bahmanid kingdom of the central Deccan was founded by 'Alā'-ad-Dīn Bahman Shāh. Later, Fīrūz Shāh III restored sultanal authority in Sind and Bengal, but made no attempt to touch the Deccan. The last Tughluqids were weaklings, and the feebleness of the sultanate enabled Tīmūr to invade India in 801/1398-9 and wreak great devastation; as a result, the political unity of the sultanate was dissolved, and various Muslim leaders seized independent power in the provinces.

For rather less than forty years, power was in the hands of Khiḍr Khan, formerly governor of Multan for Tīmūr, and he ruled in the names of Tīmūr and Shāh Rukh, contenting himself with the title of *Rāyāt-i A'lā* 'Exalted Banners'; because of a fictitious descent from the Prophet, his dynasty acquired the name of the Sayyids. The effective authority of the Sayyids was reduced to a small area around Delhi, and with their initial dependence on the Tīmūrids, they were unpopular with the

Turkish and Afghan military classes in Delhi. In 855/1451 their line was replaced by that of Bahlūl Khan, a chief of the Afghan tribe of the Lōdīs and formerly governor of Sirhind and Lahore. Bahlūl was the equal in vigour of the great Tughluqids, and did much to restore Muslim prestige in India; the authority of Delhi was reimposed over much of central India and the Sharqī rulers of Jawnpūr overthrown (881/1477). His son Sikandar II conducted operations against the Rājput states with some success, and moved his capital to Agra, which offered a better base for these attacks. The last Lōdī, Ibrāhīm II, alienated many of his nobles and commanders, and certain of these invited the Chaghatayid Mughal Bābur, then in Kabul, to intervene.

Bābur's victory at Pānīpat in 932/1526 resulted in Ibrāhīm's death and the first appearance of the line of Mughal emperors in India. But this did not yet mean the permanent establishment of Bābur's dynasty in India, for his son Humāyūn's reign was interrupted by the fifteen years' restoration of Afghan rule there by Shīr Shāh Sūr. Operating from Bihār, Shīr Shāh defeated Humāyūn at Kanawj, thus negativing all Bābur's work (947/1540). As well as being a fine general, Shīr Shāh introduced important fiscal and land reforms. But for his premature death, a strong Afghan sultanate might have been implanted in India, discouraging Humāyūn from trying his fortunes once more; as it was, the weakness of Shīr Shāh's ephemeral successors facilitated a Mughal revanche.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Lane Poole, 295-303; Justi, 464-5.
Zambaur, 285-8; Sachau, 33 (on the Sūrīs).
C. H. Philips, ed. *Handbook of oriental history* (London 1951), 88-9.
R. C. Majumdar and A. D. Pusalker, eds. *The history and culture of the Indian people*. V *The struggle for empire* (Bombay 1957).
idem. and A. K. Majumdar, eds. VI *The Delhi Sultanate* (Bombay 1960).
R. C. Majumdar, H. C. Raychaudhuri and K. Datta, *An advanced history of India*[2] (London 1960).
EI[2] 'Dihlī Sultanate' (P. Hardy).

⟨74⟩

The Bengal Sultans
737-984/1336-1576

1. In eastern Bengal

737/1336	Fakhr-ad-Dīn Mubārak Shāh
750-3/1349-52	Ikhtiyār-ad-Dīn Ghāzī Shāh
	Conquest by Shams-ad-Dīn Ilyās Shāh

2. In western Bengal and then in all Bengal

740/1339	'Alā'-ad-Dīn 'Alī Shāh

Line of Ilyās Shāh:

746/1345	Shams-ad-Dīn Ilyās Shāh
759/1358	Sikandar Shāh I
792/1390	Ghiyāth-ad-Dīn A'ẓam Shāh
813/1410	Sayf-ad-Dīn Ḥamza Shāh
815/1412	Shihāb-ad-Dīn Bāyazīd Shāh
817/1414	'Alā'-ad-Dīn Fīrūz Shāh

Line of Rājā Gaṇeśa:

817/1414	Jalāl-ad-Dīn Muḥammad Shāh
835-40/1432-6	Shams-ad-Dīn Aḥmad Shāh

Line of Ilyās Shāh restored:

841/1437	Nāṣir-ad-Dīn Maḥmūd Shāh
864/1460	Rukn-ad-Dīn Bārbak Shāh
879/1474	Shams-ad-Dīn Yūsuf Shāh
886/1481	Sikandar Shāh II
886-92/1481-87	Jalāl-ad-Dīn Fatḥ Shāh

Line of Ḥabashīs:

892/1487	Sulṭān Shāhzāda Bārbak Shāh
892/1487	Sayf-ad-Dīn Fīrūz Shāh
895/1490	Nāṣir-ad-Dīn Maḥmūd Shāh
896-99/1491-4	Shams-ad-Dīn Muẓaffar Shāh

Line of Sayyid Ḥusayn Shāh:

899/1494	Sayyid ʿAlāʾ-ad-Dīn Ḥusayn Shāh
925/1519	Nāṣir-ad-Dīn Nuṣrat Shāh
939/1532	ʿAlāʾ-ad-Dīn Fīrūz Shāh
940-6/1533-9	Ghiyāth-ad-Dīn Maḥmūd Shāh

Line of Sūrī Afghans:

946/1539	Shīr Shāh Sūr
947/1540	Khiḍr Khan
952/1545	Muḥammad Khan Sūr
962/1555	Khiḍr Khan Bahādur Shāh
968-71/1561-4	Ghiyāth-ad-Dīn Jalāl Shāh

Line of Sulaymān Karārānī:

971/1564	Sulaymān Karārānī
980/1572	Bāyazīd Shāh Karārānī
980-4/1572-6	Dāʾūd Shāh Karārānī
	Mughal conquest

The administration of Bengal had always been a problem for the Delhi sultans; the province's richness of resources and its distance from the capital constituted standing temptations for its governors to rebel. After the death of Balban in 686/1287, Bengal became virtually independent under governors who ruled at Lakhnāwatī, and in the opening years of the fourteenth century, eastern Bengal was conquered and Muslim troops crossed the Brahmaputra into the Sylhet district of Assam. Ghiyāth-ad-Dīn Tughluq for a time reasserted the control of Delhi, and divided Bengal into two governorships, one in the west centred on Lakhnāwatī and one in the east centred on Sonārgāon. But after his death, Bengal fell into the hands of Fakhr-ad-Dīn Mubārak in the east and ʿAlāʾ-ad-Dīn ʿAlī in the west, and for the next two and a half centuries, Bengal was to be ruled by independent sultans. Over these years, conversions to Islam amongst the Hindu lower classes grew steadily, leading to the present-day preponderance of Muslims in the region.

The house of Shams-ad-Dīn Ilyās united all Bengal under one crown. Under the Ilyāsids, the Muslim arts and sciences flourished, and commerce in Bengal's textiles and foodstuffs

was encouraged. In the first decade of the fifteenth century, Ghiyāth-ad-Dīn Aʿẓam renewed old diplomatic and cultural ties with China, and the growth of the port of Chittagong probably reflects increased trade with the Far East. The reign of the Ilyāsids was interrupted for over twenty years by the seizure of power of Rājā Gaṇeśa, a local Hindu landowner of Bhātūryā. He seems to have been the power behind the throne for some years, finally usurping authority for his son Jadu, who became a Muslim and ruled as Jalāl-ad-Dīn Muḥammad. Despite Hindu origins, the line of Gaṇeśa was able to rule with some Muslim support. Under the restored Ilyāsids, the influence of the Abyssinian or Ḥabashī palace guards grew, until in 892/1487 their commander, the eunuch Sulṭān Shāhzāda, murdered the last Ilyāsid and assumed power himself.

Order was eventually restored by Sayyid ʿAlāʾ-ad-Dīn Ḥusayn, whose enlightened rule came opportunely after the chaos of the Ḥabashī period. Bihār was annexed; asylum was given to the Sharqī ruler of Jawnpūr, deposed by the Lōdīs of Delhi, and the Jawnpūr troops added to the Bengal army. The growth of a vernacular Bengali literature was a process continuing through these centuries, and royal encouragement is seen in Nuṣrat Shāh b. Sayyid Ḥasan's patronage of a Bengali translation of the *Mahābhārata*. The line of Sayyid Ḥusayn was ended by the meteoric rise of the Afghan chief Shīr Shāh Sūr, who took over Bengal and used it as a base from which to eject the Mughal Humāyūn from India. But once the Mughals were firmly re-established in Lahore and Delhi and the Afghans defeated, Mughal influence began to be felt in Bengal. Sulaymān Karārānī, the former governor of southern Bihār, acknowledged the suzerainty of Akbar, and in 984/1576 Bengal was overrun and incorporated in the Mughal empire.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Lane Poole, 305–8; Zambaur, 286, 289.
Philips, ed. *Handbook of oriental history*, 89–90.
Majumdar, *et al.*, eds. *The Delhi Sultanate*.
Majumdar, *et al. An advanced history of India*.

⟨75⟩
The Sultans of Kashmīr
747-997/1346-1589

1. Line of Shāh Mīrzā Swātī

747/1346	Shams-ad-Dīn Shāh Mīrzā Swātī
750/1349	Jamshīd
751/1350	ʿAlāʾ-ad-Dīn ʿAlī Shīr
760/1359	Shihāb-ad-Dīn Shīrāshāmak
780/1378	Quṭb-ad-Dīn Hindāl
796/1394	Sikandar But-shikan
819/1416	ʿAlī Mīrzā Khan
823/1420	Zayn-al-ʿĀbidīn Shāhī Khan
875/1470	Ḥaydar Shāh Ḥājjī Khan
876/1471	Ḥasan
894/1489	Muḥammad, *first reign*
895/1490	Fat'ḥ Shāh, *first reign*
903/1498	Muḥammad, *second reign*
904/1499	Fat'ḥ Shāh, *second reign*
905/1500	Muḥammad, *third reign*
932/1526	Ibrāhīm I
933/1527	Nāzuk, *first reign*
935/1529	Muḥammad, *fourth reign*
939/1533	Shams-ad-Dīn
947/1540	Nāzuk, *second reign*
947/1540	*Ḥaydar Dughlat, governor for Humāyūn*
958/1551	Nāzuk, *third reign*
959/1552	Ibrāhīm II
962/1555	Ismāʿīl
964-8/1557-61	Ḥabīb
	Dethroned by Ghāzī Khan Chak

2. Line of Ghāzī Khān Chak

968/1561	Ghāzī Khan b. Chak
971/1563	Naṣr-ad-Dīn Ḥusayn
977/1569	Ẓahīr-ad-Dīn ʿAlī
986/1579	Naṣr-ad-Dīn Yūsuf
994/1586	Yaʿqūb
997/1589	*Submission to the Mughal Emperor Akbar*

Because of its geographical position, separated by mountain barriers from the plains of northern India, Kashmīr was long sheltered from Muslim raids. It remained under its own dynasty of Hindu rulers long after most of northern India had passed under Muslim control. Maḥmūd of Ghazna made two attempts to invade Kashmīr from the south, in 406/1015 and 412/1021, but was held up on both occasions by the fortress of Lohkot. However, Muslim Turkish mercenaries (*Turushka*) began to be employed by the Hindu kings, and the process of Islamisation, which has made Kashmīr today an overwhelmingly Muslim province, must have begun.

In 735/1335 the throne there was seized by Shāh Mīrzā Swātī, a Muslim adventurer who was probably of Pathan origin, and who had been minister to Rājā Sinha Deva. The régime of Shams-ad-Dīn (this being the *laqab* which Shāh Mīrzā adopted) was tolerant and mild towards the Hindus; but his grandson Sikandar was a pious Muslim who patronised the ulema and scholars and who persecuted the Hindus, destroying their temples and earning the epithet *But-shikan* 'Idol-breaker'. However, his son Zayn-al-ʿĀbidīn reversed this rigorist policy, and his long and enlightened reign was something of a golden age for Kashmīr; under his patronage, the *Mahābhārata* and Kalhana's metrical chronicle of Kashmīr, the *Rājataranginī*, were translated into Persian. Unfortunately, his descendants were lesser men, and much internecine strife now followed; various provincial chiefs took advantage of the mountainous and difficult terrain and established a virtual independence. In particular, the influence of the powerful Chak tribe grew, its leaders serving as ministers and commanders for the last feeble rulers of Shāh Mīrzā's line. The Mughal prince Ḥaydar Dughlat invaded Kashmīr in 947/1540, and ruled in Srinagar for ten years on behalf of his kinsman Humāyūn, until he was killed in a rising. The Chak family was again in the ascendant, and after 968/1561 ruled as sovereigns themselves, assuming the title *Pādishāh* 'Monarch' in imitation of the Mughals. The last Chaks ruled as vassals of Akbar, until the province was at last fully incorporated into the Mughal empire.

The elucidation of the chronology of the Muslim rulers of Kashmīr presents many difficulties; Lane Poole, 311 n., found it impossible to construct a table of any reliability. The task of

elucidation was undertaken by Sir T. Wolseley Haig (see below), and his results have been followed in the list given above; it presents a considerable number of serious differences from Zambaur's list.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Justi, 478; Sachau, 32-3; Zambaur, 293-4.
Sir T. W. Haig, 'The chronology and genealogy of the Muhammadan Kings of Kashmir', JRAS (1198), 451-68.
idem., in *Cambridge History of India*, III, *Turks and Afghans* (Cambridge 1928), 277-93, 698-700.

⟨76⟩
The Sultans of Gujarāt
793-991/1391-1583
Western India

793/1391	Ẓafar Khan Muẓaffar I
814/1411	Aḥmad I
846/1442	Muḥammad Karīm
855/1451	Quṭb-ad-Dīn Aḥmad II
862/1458	Dā'ūd
862/1458	Maḥmūd I Begṛā
917/1511	Muẓaffar II
932/1526	Sikandar
932/1526	Nāṣir Khan Maḥmūd II
932/1526	Bahādur
943/1537	*Mīrān Muḥammad I of Khāndesh*
943/1537	Maḥmūd III
961/1554	Aḥmad III
968/1561	Muẓaffar III, *first reign*
980/1573	*Mughal conquest*
991/1583	Muẓaffar III, *second reign* *Definitive Mughal conquest*

Because of its commercial and maritime connections with the other shores of the Indian Ocean, Gujarāt was a particularly rich province; but although Maḥmūd of Ghazna had marched through it on his way to Somnāth, permanent Muslim conquest was quite long delayed. Not till 697/1298 did the troops of 'Alā'-ad-Dīn Muḥammad Khaljī defeat the main local Hindu dynasty, the Vāghelās of Anahilwāra. During the fourteenth century Gujarāt was ruled by governors sent out by the Delhi sultans, until in 793/1391 Muḥammad III sent out Ẓafar Khan. As the Tughluqids fell into palpable decline, Ẓafar Khan became in effect independent, and in 810/1407 formally assumed the insignia of royalty as Muẓaffar Shāh. The new sultanate was consolidated by his grandson Aḥmad I, much of whose reign was occupied by warfare against the Hindu Rājās of Gujarāt and Rājputāna and against the Muslim sultans of Mālwa, Khāndesh, and the Deccan; it was he who built for himself the new capital of Aḥmadābād, which replaced that of

Anahilwāra. The fifty-four years of Maḥmūd Begṛā's reign (862-917/1458-1511) were the greatest in the history of the sultanate. Campaigns against the Hindus led, amongst other things, to the capture of the fortress of Chāmpāner, now renamed Muḥammadābād and made the Sultan's capital; indeed, during Maḥmūd's reign the Gujarāt sultanate attained its greatest extent before the annexation of Mālwa.

A new factor in the politics of western and southern India appeared towards the end of Maḥmūd's reign, *sc.* the Portuguese. After Vasco da Gama appeared at Calicut in 1498, the Portuguese began to divert much of the Indian Ocean commerce into their own hands, thus bypassing the traders of Egypt and Gujarāt. Hence in 931/1508 Maḥmūd allied with the Mamlūk sultan Qānṣūḥ al-Ghawrī, but despite the initial Muslim naval victory near Bombay over Dom Lourenço de Almeida, the Portuguese captured Goa from the neighbouring 'Ādil-Shāhīs of Bījapūr and Maḥmūd was compelled to make peace. The last great sultan of Gujarāt was Maḥmūd's grandson Bahādur Shāh, who assumed the offensive against the Hindus and also conquered Mālwa, only to lose it and part of his own dominions to the Mughal Humāyūn. The menace of the Portuguese revived, and despite the grant to them of Diu, they treacherously murdered Bahādur Shāh in 943/1537. The unity of Gujarāt now crumbled; dynastic quarrels broke out, and the kingdom began to split up amongst various nobles. In despair, the Mughals were called in, and Akbar took over Gujarāt, although the last sultan, Muẓaffar III, made several attempts at a revanche till his death in 1001/1593.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Lane Poole, 312-14; Justi, 476.
Zambaur, 296.
Philips, ed., *Handbook of oriental history*, 91.
Majumdar, *et al.*, eds., *The Delhi Sultanate.*
Majumdar, *et al.*, *An advanced history of India.*
EI² 'Gudjarāt' (J. Burton-Page).

⟨77⟩
The Sharqī Sultans of Jawnpūr
796-883/1394-1479

796/1394	Malik Sarvar, Khwāja-yi Jihān
802/1399	Mubārak Shāh
804/1402	Shams-ad-Dīn Ibrāhīm
844/1440	Maḥmūd Shāh
861/1457	Muḥammad Shāh
862-83/1458-79	Ḥusayn Shāh
	Conquest by Lōdī Sultans of Delhi

Jawnpūr lies on the Gumtī river to the north of Benares, between what were later the provinces of Bihār and Oudh, and is traditionally said to have been founded in 762/1359 by the Tughluqid Fīrūz Shāh III and named after his cousin and patron Muḥammad b. Tughluq, one of whose names was Jawna (< *Yāvana* 'foreigner') Shāh. In the fifteenth century it became the centre of a powerful Muslim state, situated between the sultanates of Delhi and Bengal, and the sultans of Jawnpūr played a significant rôle in developing the Islamic culture of the area; Jawnpūr, indeed, became known as 'the Shīrāz of the East'.

The dynasty was founded by one Malik Sarvar, the eunuch slave minister of the last Tughluqid Maḥmūd Shāh II, who conquered Oudh on behalf of his master in 796/1394 and then remained there as virtual ruler, persuading the sultan to grant him the title of *Malik ash-Sharq* 'King of the East', whence the title of the dynasty. Helped by the chaos which followed Tīmūr's invasion of India, his adopted son Mubārak Shāh behaved as a fully independent ruler, minting his own coins and making the *khuṭba* or Friday sermon in his own name alone. His brother Ibrāhīm was the greatest of the Sharqīs and during his reign of nearly forty years the dynasty reached a peak of affluence and power. A particularly fine local school of Islamic architecture developed in Jawnpūr, and being himself a man of culture, Ibrāhīm encouraged scholars and writers at his court. His successors were drawn into warfare with the Lōdī sultans of Delhi and raided Gwalior, but were most successful in attacking Orissa. According to Muslim chronicles, Jawnpur

possessed at this time one of the biggest armies in India. The last Sharqī sultan, Ḥusayn, reached the gates of Delhi on one occasion, but Bahlūl Lōdī eventually turned the tables on him. He defeated Ḥusayn and expelled him to Bengal; thus Jawnpūr passed under the control of the Delhi sultanate.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Lane Poole, 309; Zambaur, 292.
Philips, ed. *Handbook of oriental history*, 91.
Majumdar, *et al.*, eds. *The Delhi Sultanate.*
Majumdar, *et al.*, *An advanced history of India.*

⟨78⟩
The Sultans of Mālwa
804-937/1401-1531
Central India

1. Line of Ghūrīs

804/1401	Dilāvar Khan Ḥusayn Ghūrī
808/1405	Alp Khan Hūshang
838/1435	Ghaznī Khan Muḥammad
839/1436	Mas'ūd Khan

2. Line of Khaljīs

839/1436	Maḥmūd Shāh I Khaljī
873/1469	Ghiyāth Shāh
906/1500	Nāṣir Shāh
917-37/1511-31	Maḥmūd Shāh II
	Conquest by the Sultans of Gujarāt

Muslim rule in Mālwa was only established after long and bloody struggles with the local Rājput rulers of Chitōr and Ujjain. In 705/1305 the Delhi sultan 'Alā'-ad-Dīn Khaljī despatched an army which subjugated Mālwa, and thereafter governors were sent out to the region from Delhi. The governor of Mālwa, Dilāvar Khan Ghūrī, sheltered the refugee Tughluqid Maḥmūd Shāh II during Tīmūr's invasion of 801/1398-9, but the shock to the fabric of the Delhi sultanate in this period permitted Dilāvar Khan shortly afterwards to declare his independence and assume the insignia of royalty. Mālwa's achievement of independence thus parallels the rise of the Sharqīs in Jawnpūr. The Mālwa sultans made their capital the inaccessible and heavily-defended fortress of Māndū, and adorned it with many splendid buildings.

At one point, the Ghūrī sultans of Mālwa undertook a raid into Hindu Orissa, but most of their military activity was against neighbouring Muslim rulers, such as the Sharqīs, the Gujarāt sultans, the Sayyids of Delhi and the Bahmanids of the Deccan; in this warfare, they did not hesitate to ally with Hindu princes. In 839/1436 the chief minister Maḥmūd Khan took over the throne in Mālwa (the last Ghūrī sultan fleeing to Gujarāt), and began the line of the Khaljīs there. Maḥmūd I

Khaljī was the greatest of the Mālwa sultans, and despite several setbacks in his campaigns against the Rājputs of Chitōr and the Bahmanids, expanded his territories considerably. His fame spread outside India, and he received a formal investiture of power from the ʿAbbāsid caliph in Cairo. But during the reign of his great-grandson Maḥmūd II, there arose an ascendancy of Rājput ministers and courtiers in the state, and tensions between Muslim and Hindu elements grew. At one point, Maḥmūd was captured by the Rājā of Chitōr, and though he was restored in Mālwa, his kingdom fell in 937/1531 to Bahādur Shāh of Gujarāt. The line of Khaljīs was thus extinguished; during the next three decades, Mālwa passed to the Mughal Humāyūn, to an independent local commander of the Khaljīs, to the Afghan Shīr Shāh Sūr, and finally back to the Mughals.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Lane Poole, 310-11; Justi, 477.
Zambaur, 292.
Philips, ed., *Handbook of oriental history*, 90.
Majumdar, *et al.*, eds., *The Delhi Sultanate.*
Majumdar, *et al.*, *An advanced history of India.*
EI[1] 'Mālwā' (T. W. Haig).

⟨79⟩
The Bahmanids and their successors
748-934/1347-1527
Northern Deccan

748/1347	ʿAlāʾ-ad-Dīn Ḥasan Bahman Shāh	
759/1358	Muḥammad I	
776/1375	ʿAlāʾ-ad-Dīn Mujāhid	
780/1378	Dāʾūd	
780/1378	Muḥammad II	
799/1397	Ghiyāth-ad-Dīn	
799/1397	Shams-ad-Dīn	
800/1397	Tāj-ad-Dīn Fīrūz	
825/1422	Aḥmad I Walī	
839/1436	ʿAlāʾ-ad-Dīn Aḥmad II	
862/1458	ʿAlāʾ-ad-Dīn Humāyūn Ẓālim	
865/1461	Niẓām	
867/1463	Muḥammad III Lashkarī	
887/1482	Maḥmūd	
924/1518	Aḥmad III	nominal sultans under the tutelage of the chief minister Amīr Barīd of Bīdar
927/1521	ʿAlāʾ-ad-Dīn	
928/1522	Walī-Allāh	
931-4/1525-27	Kalīm-Allāh	
	Dissolution of the Bahmanid sultanate into five local sultanates, see below	

As the authority of Muḥammad b. Tughluq waned in the second half of his reign, the recently-conquered parts of the Deccan began to fall away from Delhi. The governor of Maʿbar in the extreme south proclaimed himself independent and founded the sultanate of Madura. Much more powerful and enduring was the state founded on the table-land of the Deccan by the amīr Ḥasan Gangū. Ḥasan's origins are very obscure, but they seem to have been humble ones; the claim to Persian descent, seen in his assumption of the old Iranian name of Bahman (= the son of Isfandiyār in the national epic) should not be taken seriously. After his successful rebellion in Dawlatābād, Ḥasan transferred his capital southwards to Gulbarga, and for eighty years this remained the Bahmanid centre.

The rise of the Bahmanids meant that a strong and aggressive

Muslim power now confronted the two chief Hindu kingdoms of the southern Deccan, Warangal, and Vijayanagar. For the next century or so, warfare was frequent, ending in the case of Warangal by its overthrow in 830/1425 by Aḥmad I Shāh and its incorporation into the Bahmanid state; Vijayanagar, on the other hand, was never conquered. A point of note in this warfare is the use from the second half of the fourteenth century onwards of artillery and firearms, knowledge of these weapons being acquired through South India's connections with lands further west. After the conquest of Warangal, Aḥmad moved his capital to the more central Bīdar, and he also carried the war northwards against the Muslim rulers of Gujarāt and Mālwa.

The Bahmanids thus acquired considerable fame in the Islamic world at large, especially as they made their court a great centre of learning; it was also under them that a specifically Deccan style of Muslim architecture evolved. The Bahmanids were the first power in the subcontinent to exchange ambassadors with the Ottomans (between Muḥammad III Shāh and Mehmet the Conqueror). The Bahmanid state, as well as being militarily powerful, had a well-organised administrative system. There was, accordingly, a need for skilled personnel, and many Turks, Persians, Arabs, etc. entered the sultans' service. It was through this that there arose in the fifteenth century tensions between the native Deccan Muslims and these 'outsiders' (*Āfāqīs*, *Pardesīs*). The mounting internal chaos in the state and increasing ineffectiveness of the rulers is largely explicable by these rivalries. At the end of the fifteenth century, signs of disintegration appeared. The last four sultans were *fainéants* under the tutelage of the Turkish amīr Qāsim Barīdī and his family, and when the last ruler died in 934/1527, the dynasty came to an end.

From now until the conquests of the Mughals Akbar and Awrangzīb, the Muslim Deccan was divided amongst five local dynasties, all springing from former servants of the Bahmanids.

The Barīdī family at first controlled the rump of the Bahmanid kingdom from Bīdar, and then ruled as the independent Barīd-Shāhīs until absorbed by the 'Ādil-Shāhīs of Bījapūr in 1028/1619. However, the first provincial dynasty definitely to break with the Bahmanids was that of the 'Imād-Shāhīs of Berār (890-980/1485-1572), descendants of Fat'ḥ-Allāh 'Imād-

al-Mulk, governor of Berār, who ruled there till their territories were annexed by the Niẓām-Shāhīs. The 'Ādil-Shāhīs (895-1097/1490-1686) sprang from Yūsuf 'Ādil Khan, governor of Bījapūr and himself of Turkish origin; his dynasty continued until Awrangzīb captured Bījapūr. The Niẓām-Shāhīs (896-1044/1491-1633) began with Aḥmad b. Niẓām-al-Mulk, governor of Junnar, and then ruled in Aḥmadnagar and Dawlatābād. The Niẓām-Shāhīs were conquered by Akbar, but a line of nominal sovereigns continued till Shāh Jihān's time. Finally, the Quṭb-Shāhīs of Golconda (918-1098/1512-1687) grew up on the ruins of the old Hindu kingdom of Warangal. Their founder was a Turkish commander of Qara Qoyunlu origin, Sulṭān Qulī Quṭb-al-Mulk, who was appointed governor of Telingāna by Maḥmūd Shāh Bahmanī; his line persisted down to the time of Awrangzīb. The atmosphere in which these five states flourished was one of incessant rivalry and squabbling, as a result of which, a Hindu revival in the Deccan was favoured. All but the Barīd-Shāhīs and 'Imād-Shāhīs were Shī'ī (a faith favoured by some of the later Bahmanids), and in this period, close diplomatic and cultural links were kept up with Ṣafavid Persia, although these connections were insufficient to save them from absorption by the Mughals.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Lane Poole, 316-21; Justi, 470-1.
Zambaur, 297-9
Philips, ed., *Handbook of Oriental history*, 91-2.
(All with detailed tables of the five successor-states to the Bahmanids.)
Majumdar, *et al.*, eds., *The Delhi Sultanate*.
Majumdar, *et al.*, *An advanced history of India*.
H. K. Sherwani, *The Bahmanis of the Deccan* (Hyderabad-Deccan 1953), with a detailed genealogical table.
EI² 'Bahmanis' (H. K. Sherwani).

⟨80⟩
The Fārūqī Sultans of Khāndesh
772-1009/1370-1601
Northern Deccan

772/1370	Malik Rājā Fārūqī
801/1399	Nāṣir Khan
841/1437	ʿĀdil Khan I
844/1441	Mīrān Mubārak Khan I
861/1457	ʿĀdil Khan II
909/1503	Dāʾūd Khan
916/1510	Ghaznī Khan
916/1510	ʿĀlam Khan
916/1510	ʿĀdil Khan III
926/1520	Mīrān Muḥammad I
943/1537	Aḥmad Shāh
943/1537	Mubārak Shāh II
974/1566	Mīrān Muḥammad II
984/1576	Ḥasan Shāh
985/1577	Rājā ʿAlī Khan, or ʿĀdil Shāh IV
1005-9/1597-1601	Bahādur Shāh
	Conquest by the Mughals

The state of Khāndesh ('Land of the Khans') lay immediately to the south of Mālwa, in the valley of the Tāptī river and to the north of the Bahmanid kingdom of the Deccan. The founder of the dynasty, Malik Rājā, was originally in the service of the Bahmanids, but then transferred to the court of Fīrūz Shāh III, and was appointed by the Delhi sultan as governor over certain districts in the northern Deccan. In the confusion of the declining years of the Tughluqids, Malik Rājā followed the example of his neighbour in Mālwa, Dilāvar Khan, and declared his independence. Since he claimed descent from the caliph ʿUmar b. al-Khaṭṭāb, his successors called themselves the Fārūqīs (*al-Fārūq* 'the Just' being a name given to that caliph). His son Nāṣir Khan captured the fortress of Asīrgarh from its Hindu chief, and built close by it the town of Burhānpūr, henceforth the capital of the sultans of Khāndesh. Under ʿĀdil Khan II, Khāndesh flourished exceedingly; he failed to throw off the suzerainty of the Sultans of Gujarāt, but he did

extend his power eastwards against the Hindu Rājās of Gondwāna and Jhārkand, and his exploits earned him the title of *Shāh-i Jhārkund* 'King of the Forest'.

In the early years of the sixteenth century, Khāndesh was racked by succession disputes, which conduced to the intervention of outside powers, and especially of the Gujarāt sultans and the epigoni of the Bahmanids in Aḥmadnagar, the Niẓām-Shāhīs. With only weak resources of their own, the Fārūqīds' policy aimed at conciliating the powerful Gujarāt sultans, and at one point Mīrān Muḥammad I was designated heir-presumptive to Gujarāt; he died, however, before this claim could be consolidated. The first clash of the Fārūqīs with the Mughals occurred in 962/1555, and the former became vassals of Akbar. But after c. 993/1585, direct Mughal pressure grew; Bahādur Shāh offended the Mughals, and his fortress of Asīrgarh was in 1009/1601 captured by Akbar and the surviving Fārūqīs carried off into exile.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Lane Poole, 315; Justi, 477; Zambaur, 295.
Philips, ed., *Handbook of oriental history*, 91.
Majumdar, *et al.*, eds., *The Delhi Sultanate*.
Majumdar, *et al.*, *An advanced history of India*.
EI² 'Fārūḳids' (P. Hardy).

⟨81⟩

The Mughal Emperors
932-1274/1526-1858

932/1526	Ẓahīr-ad-Dīn Bābur
937/1530	Nāṣir-ad-Dīn Humāyūn, *first reign*
947-62/1540-55	*Sūrī sultans of Delhi*
962/1555	Humāyūn, *second reign*
963/1556	Jalāl-ad-Dīn Akbar I
1014/1605	Nūr-ad-Dīn Jihāngīr
1037/1627	Dāwar Bakhsh
1037/1628	Shihāb-ad-Dīn Shāh Jihān I
1068/1657	Murād Bakhsh (in Gujarāt)
1068/1657	Shāh Shujā' (in Bengal till 1070/1660)
1068/1658	Muḥyī-ad-Dīn Awrangzīb 'Ālamgīr I
1118/1707	A'ẓam Shāh
1119/1707	Kām Bakhsh (in the Deccan)
1119/1707	Shāh 'Ālam I Bahādur Shāh I
1124/1712	'Aẓīm-ash-Sha'n
1124/1712	Mu'izz-ad-Dīn Jihāndār
1124/1713	Farrukh-siyar
1131/1719	Shams-ad-Dīn Rafī'-ad-Darajāt
1131/1719	Rafī'-ad-Dawla Shāh Jihān II
1131/1719	Nīkū-siyar
1131/1719	Nāṣir-ad-Dīn Muḥammad
1161/1748	Aḥmad Shāh Bahādur
1167/1754	'Azīz-ad-Dīn 'Ālamgīr II
1173/1760	Shāh Jihān III
1173/1760	Jalāl-ad-Dīn 'Alī Jawhar Shāh 'Ālam II, *first reign*
1202/1788	Bīdār-bakht
1203/1788	Shāh 'Ālam II, *second reign*
1221/1806	Mu'īn-ad-Dīn Akbar II
1253-74/1837-58	Sirāj-ad-Dīn Bahādur Shāh II
	Direct British rule

Bābur, the founder of the Mughal line, was a Chaghatay Turk, separated from Tīmūr by five generations on his father's side and from Chingiz Khan on his mother's. His father 'Umar Shaykh b. Abī-Sa'īd ruled a small Tīmūrid principality in the

Central Asian region of Farghāna, but Bābur found that the rising power of the Shaybānī Özbegs made it impossible for him to retain a foothold there. Accordingly, in 910/1504 he occupied Kabul, and almost immediately made his first raid into India as far as the Indus. It seems that Bābur only turned to India when his repeated attempts to gain power in his Central Asian homeland had failed, but eventually a discontented faction at the Lōdī court in Delhi invited him to intervene. He defeated the sultan Ibrāhīm II at Pānīpat in 932/1526, and in the next year, the Rājput chiefs at Kānwā near Agra. Yet these victories were only a beginning; there was as yet no solid structure of Mughal power, and the reaction of the Afghan chiefs, led by Shīr Shāh Sūr, caused Bābur's son Humāyūn to flee from northern India to Sind and then to Afghanistan for fifteen years. Only the weakness of Shīr Shāh's successors allowed Humāyūn to return in 962/1555 and establish himself in Delhi and Agra.

The fifty years' reign of Akbar the Great now followed. The Mughal hold on northern and central India was made firm: Mālwa and the independent Rājput states, Gujarāt and Khāndesh were secured, and by 984/1576 Bengal was restored once more to the control of Delhi. The north-western frontier, gateway to India for so many invaders, was secured by the acquisition of Kabul and Qandahār, although the latter town was to be a bone of contention with the Persians for a long time to come. In the Deccan, the northern tier of the successor-states to the Bahmanids were either directly annexed or made to acknowledge Akbar's supremacy, but the military and administrative control of the Mughals was not yet strong enough for full authority to be exercised there; this was to be the work of Awrangzīb. On the diplomatic level, the initially friendly relations with the Ṣafavids were exchanged for an agreement with the Özbeg 'Abdallāh Khan over the demarcation of respective territories. There was also contact with the Ottomans over the common threat from the Portuguese in the Indian Ocean, but the distances between Delhi and Istanbul were too vast for a Sunnī Grand Alliance to emerge.

Akbar was thus undeniably a great general and statesman, but he is perhaps more interesting as a thinker and religious reformer. His syncretistic *Dīn-i Ilāhī* shows his deep intellec-

tual curiosity about religions in general. Hindus participated to a greater extent than usual in the administration and direction of the empire. It was under Akbar that the governmental system of the empire took shape, and he welded together into a ruling class diverse ethnic elements, comprising Turks, Afghans, Persians, and Hindus. This class formed the *manṣabdārīs*, holders of official appointments who were obliged to provide a certain number of troops. Official salaries were in part paid by *jāgirs* or land grants, which were not, however, hereditary like the *iqṭāʿs* of the Islamic lands further west. Although the ruler himself had theoretically unbridled secular authority, the early Mughals at least were benevolent rather than tyrannical despots; moreover, the very vastness of the empire inhibited over-centralisation.

Akbar's successors Jihāngīr and Shāh Jihān continued the policy of enforcing obedience over outlying parts–over the Rājputs of Mewār, the Shīʿī sultanates of the Deccan, the Portuguese on the coast of Bengal–but Shāh Jihān's ambitions of uniting Central Asia and India in a grand Sunnī empire only ended in failure and loss of prestige (1057/1647).

In a savage succession war after Shāh Jihān's death, Awrangzīb twice defeated his brother Dārā Shikōh (1068-9/1658-9) and began a fifty years' reign. He broke with the liberal and eclectic traditions of his predecessors. He attacked lax social and religious practices which had grown up in Muslim India under the all-pervading influence of the surrounding Hindu majority society, attempting a reformation along the lines enunciated in the eighteenth century by Shāh Walī-Allāh of Delhi. In part, Awrangzīb's policy was a reaction against the renewed vigour, intellectual and material, of Hinduism; yet he continued to let Hindus form an integral part of the Mughal military and administrative structure. His military efforts were at first directed at strengthening the northwestern frontier, where fierce fighting was necessary to assert control over the Pathans. Latterly, he became increasingly concerned over the Deccan: the remaining Shīʿī sultanates were completely extinguished, and the Marāṭhās checked; yet this last success was only temporary, and the high-point of Muslim influence in the Deccan under Awrangzīb was never to be reached again.

Awrangzīb's death in 1118/1707 began the agonising decline

of the Mughals. A series of ephemeral rulers was raised to power, whilst the outlying provinces of the empire fell into the hands of such groups as the Marāṭhās, Jāts, Sikhs, and Rohilla Afghans. Nādir Shāh's invasion of India in 1151-2/1738-9 and the occupation of Delhi, and the subsequent campaigns of Aḥmad Shāh Durrānī, dealt the empire material and moral blows from which it never recovered. On all sides, Hindu fortunes were reviving, and the factor of the English was now significant in the interior of the subcontinent as well as in the coastlands. Whilst the English were extending their power through Bengal to Oudh, Central India, and Rājputāna, the Mughals in Delhi could only look on helplessly. Shāh 'Ālam II was an English pensioner, and in 1274/1858 the last Mughal was deposed and exiled for complicity in the Indian Mutiny.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Lane Poole, 322-9; Justi, 472-5.
Zambaur, 300 and Table U.
Philips, *Handbook of oriental history*, 89.
Majumdar, *et al.*, *An advanced history of India.*
EI[1] 'Mughals' (T. W. Haig, *et al.*).

⟨82⟩
The Kings of Afghanistan
1160- /1747-

1. Durrānīs

1160/1747	Aḥmad Shāh Durrānī
1187/1773	Tīmūr Shāh
1207/1793	Zamān Shāh
1215/1800	Maḥmūd Shāh, *first reign*
1218/1803	Shāh Shujā', *first reign* (in Kabul; from 1215/1800 ruler in Peshawar)
1224/1809	Maḥmūd, *second reign* (in Kabul till 1233/1818, in Herat till 1245/1829)
1233/1818	'Alī Shāh
1255/1839	Shujā', *second reign*
1258/1842	Fat'ḥ Jang

2. Bārakzays

1234/1819	Dōst Muḥammad
1280/1863	Shīr 'Alī, *first reign*
1283/1866	Afḍal
1284/1867	Shīr 'Alī, *second reign*
1296/1879	Muḥammad Ya'qūb Khan
1297/1880	'Abd-ar-Raḥmān Khan
1319/1901	Ḥabīb-Allāh
1337/1919	Amān-Allāh (Amānullāh)
1348/1929	Nādir Shāh
1352- /1933-	Muḥammad Ẓāhir Shāh

The Afghans had played a prominent part in Persian affairs during the declining years of the Ṣafavids, overrunning and occupying Persia during the third decade of the eighteenth century. Although Nādir Shāh ended this Afghan domination, he recruited large numbers of Afghans into his forces. One of his leading commanders was Aḥmad Khan of the Sadōzay section of the Abdālī tribe of Afghans, a tribe which was originally from the Herat region but which Nādir allowed to settle around Qandahār. When Nādir was assassinated in 1160/1747, the Afghan soldiers elected Aḥmad as their Shāh, and he assumed the title *Durr-i Durrān* 'Pearl of pearls', whence the

name of the dynasty which he founded. Aḥmad Shāh regarded himself as the heir to Nādir's eastern conquests, and invaded India several times, clashing with the Mughals and in 1170/1757 sacking Delhi and Agra. A great empire was built up in north-western India, including Sind, Baluchistan, much of the Panjab and Kashmir, and the victory of Pānīpat in 1174/1761 gave a decisive check to the ambitions of the Marāṭhās. In Khurasan, Aḥmad established a protectorate over Nādir's descendant, the blind Shāh Rukh, although in the reign of Aḥmad's grandson Zamān Shāh the Afghans were powerless to halt the advance of the Qājārs and the deposition of Shāh Rukh. Zamān Shāh's reign was, indeed, disastrous for the Durrānī empire: the family itself was rent internally, and the Sikhs and Marāṭhās pushed the Afghans out of most of their Indian possessions.

Meanwhile, the star of the influential Bārakzay or Muḥammadzay Afghans had already been rising, and in 1234/1819 Dōst Muḥammad drove Maḥmūd out of Kabul, formally assuming the title of Amīr of Kabul twenty years later. With the loss of the Indian territories, the Afghan kingdom was now a geographically compact unit, comprising the mountain and plateau region of Afghanistan proper, and this unity enabled Afghanistan to survive intact into the twentieth century, despite Persian attacks on Herat, Russian pressure in the north and two wars with Britain. Dōst Muḥammad resisted all temptations to intervene in India, and remained indifferent to the rebels' cause in the Indian Mutiny. 'Abd-ar-Raḥmān Khan established harmonious relations with the Great Powers; these were only broken by the aberrations of Amān-Allāh in 1337/1919, whose subsequent over-hasty attempts at westernisation proved his downfall, the throne passing to the family of its present holders.

BIBLIOGRAPHY. Lane Poole, 330-5; Zambaur, 304-5.
Philips, *Handbook of oriental history*, 93-4.
EI[2] 'Aḥmad Shāh Durrānī' (C. Collin Davies). 'Afghānistan. v. History' (M. Longworth Dames).
W. K. Fraser-Tytler, *Afghanistan, a study of political developments in Central and Southern Asia*[2] (London 1953), with a genealogical table of the Bārakzay family on p. 332.

INDEXES

⟨a⟩
Personal names

In general, names are classified by the ism, *except where the* ism *is not known or where a person is better known by another component of his name, such as his* laqab (*on the terms* ism *and* laqab, *see Introduction, above, p. xvi*). *Hence* Sayf-ad-Dawla, *not* 'Alī, *but* Abū-Taghlib, *and not* 'Uddat-ad-Dawla.

⟨ B ⟩

⟨I⟩

⟨ L ⟩

⟨ M ⟩

⟨ O ⟩

⟨ P ⟩

⟨ Q ⟩

〈T〉

< b >

Dynasties, Peoples, Tribes, etc.

< B >